

RELIGION IN LIFE

A CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY

Vol. XI

Summer Number, 1942

No. 3

EDITORIAL BOARD

NOLAN B. HARMON, JR., *Editor-in-Chief*

JOHN BAILLIE

WILLIAM ADAMS BROWN

G. ASHTON OLDHAM

ROBBINS WOLCOTT BARSTOW

SAMUEL MCCREA CAVERT

HOWARD C. ROBBINS

ALBERT W. BEAVEN

LYNN HAROLD HOUGH

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

JAMES R. JOY

ADVISORY COUNCIL

John Keith Benton

Angus Dun

Harris Franklin Rall

Harvie Branscomb

Umphrey Lee

Luther D. Reed

Edgar Sheffield Brightman

Edwin Lewis

Richard Roberts

Clarence Tucker Craig

Halford E. Luccock

Leslie D. Weatherhead

Albert Edward Day

Arthur Cushman

Luther A. Weigle

McGiffert, Jr.

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Church's Debt to Hitler.....Edwin R. H. Espy 323

The Organist's Function in Worship.....Seth Bingham 336

The Old Testament Idea of God and Its Modern Relevance,

J. Philip Hyatt 350

Social Reconstruction in Great Britain.....W. Hamilton Fyfe 359

The Christian Ashram Fellowship.....Jesse M. Bader 364

The Via Media of Paul Elmer More.....David Wesley Soper 373

War and Evolution.....William H. Norton 384

Preaching and Worship.....Cyril Charles Richardson 396

The New Order and the New Covenant.....James Stuart Stewart 403

Should Missions Go On?.....Basil J. Mathews 412

Law and Grace.....Walter Marshall Horton 421

Eschatology for Today.....Hugh Thomson Kerr, Jr. 428

Christ As a School of Culture.....W. E. Orchard 438

Contemporary Literature and Preaching.....Clarence Seidenspinner 444

No Night for the Valiant—a review of the Quarter's Fiction

Earl B. Marlatt 452

Book Reviews.....460

Copyright, 1942, by Whitmore and Stone. All rights reserved—no part of this magazine may be produced in any form without permission in writing from the publisher, except by a reviewer who wishes to quote brief passages in connection with a review written for inclusion in magazine or newspaper.

Printed in the United States of America

Published by

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS

150 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS
LIBRARY

Who's Who?

JESSE M. BADER, D.D. Executive Secretary of the Department of Evangelism of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York, New York.

SETH BINGHAM, D.Mus., F.A.G.O. Associate Professor of Music, Columbia University, New York, New York.

R. H. EDWIN ESPY, B.D. General Secretary of the Student Volunteer Movement, New York, New York.

W. HAMILTON FYFE, LL.D., F.R.S.C. Principal and Vice Chancellor, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland.

WALTER MARSHALL HORTON, Ph.D. Professor of Systematic Theology, The Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio.

J. PHILIP HYATT, Ph.D. Associate Professor of Old Testament, School of Religion, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

HUGH THOMSON KERR, JR., Ph.D. Associate Professor of Systematic Theology, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, New Jersey.

EARL B. MARLATT, Litt.D. Dean of the Boston School of Theology, Boston, Massachusetts.

BASIL J. MATHEWS, M.A. Professor of Christian World Relations, Andover Newton Theological School, Newton Center, Massachusetts.

WILLIAM H. NORTON, LL.D. Professor Emeritus, Department of Geology, Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa.

W. E. ORCHARD, D.D. Priest of Archdiocese of Westminster, England.

CYRIL CHARLES RICHARDSON, Th.D. Associate Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York, New York.

CLARENCE SEIDENSPINNER, Minister, First Methodist Church, Racine, Wisconsin.

DAVID WESLEY SOPER, B.D., A.M. Minister, Castle Heights Methodist Church, White Plains, New York.

JAMES STUART STEWART, B.D. Minister, North Morningside Church, Edinburgh, Scotland.

RELIGION IN LIFE is published quarterly by Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. Office of publication, 215 Demonbreun Street, Nashville, Tenn. Entered as second-class matter, January, 16, 1932, at the Post Office at Nashville, Tenn., under act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided in Section 1103, act of October 3, 1917, authorized March 16, 1923. Editorial correspondence should be addressed to RELIGION IN LIFE, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Business correspondence regarding subscriptions, etc., should be addressed to Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y. Subscription rates: \$2.00 per year, postage free to U. S. possessions and Mexico; to Canada, 18 cents additional; other foreign postage, 30 cents additional; single copies, 75 cents. For the convenience of readers in Great Britain, subscriptions will be received by The Epworth Press, 25-35 City Road, London, E.C. 1, at the rate of nine shillings and six pence per year.

The Church's Debt to Hitler

R. H. EDWIN ESPY

THANKS to National Socialism, the Church around the world has been fully warned of a major threat to its inner life. Whether it heeds the warning depends not on National Socialists, but on the Church itself.

Germany's witness to the world is that mankind is still religious. His present or recent religions may have been desultory, but he is ready to try another. The lesson of National Socialism derives not so much from its external character as a frontal attack on the Church, but from its termite character within the citadels of Christianity. Much is written and said concerning the menacing character of the National Socialist ideology, and this cannot be overstated; but it is important to recognize that the phenomenon in Germany is only one expression of a disease that is latent in the lives of nominal Christians everywhere. We will adequately combat National Socialism only as we combat a plague: uprooting the scourge at its source, but developing at the same time the power of resistance within its potential victims.

It is impossible here to give a balanced picture of the religious situation in Germany, to tell the glorious story of the miraculous and growing triumph of the Church, to weigh and balance the number of Germans to whom the observations in this article apply, or to draw the important lessons that need to be drawn for our present attitudes toward the war and for our postwar dealings with the German people. It is also impossible to make reference to the factors of politics, economics and history which any rounded account would include. In this particular article it is our concern to picture here the average man of Germany as he faces with spiritual responsiveness the subtle attractions of a new utopian religion, and to draw some conclusions for our life as a Church in America. This is written as a personal record, both because the convictions expressed derive from a number of years of close associations with Germany, and because the dilemma of the individual German can best be shown from his actual experience.

It is clear that a view of life which is rooted in the superiority of one particular race never can become universal. This is only one respect

in which National Socialism as a valid philosophy is a delusion. To the theologian or the philosopher who deals with ultimate truth, it would be false to regard National Socialism as a true religion. To the psychologist, however, observing its effects on the emotions and actions of individual persons, or to the sociologist, observing its effects in terms of social results, it is just as completely religious as the religion whose precepts are universal. It is a religion in what it causes men to believe and do. The very fact that the faith and action it elicits are not essentially rooted in a universal truth makes it all the more insidious.

National Socialism is a religion, first of all, in its *messianic interpretation of history*. It is probably impossible for one who has not actually lived for an extended period of time among the people of Germany to understand the subtle and persistent impingement of Hitler's personality upon their daily lives and hourly decisions. The instruments at the disposal of the Party have developed with unbelievable effectiveness the myth of Hitler, The Deliverer.

The story of the Fuehrer's saviorhood is told in varying keys, depending on the audience sought. From the simple tales prepared for children three and four years of age, to be related by the mother in the home, to the pseudo-sophisticated philosophy of Ernst Krieck, now the Rector of Heidelberg University, the story is much the same. In a course on the philosophy of history with Krieck in 1935 it was clear after the first four lectures that he was building an iron-clad case for the present resurgence of Germany as the logical peak of history and as the attainment of the highest purpose of the plan of God. For simpler minds, the story runs like this:

A generation ago the German nation was attacked by all the other nations of the world. Her soldiers were fighting valiantly on the field of battle and were about to win the war, but the Jews at home prevented the food from the farms of the Fatherland from going to the front-line trenches to keep the soldiers alive. They were thus obliged to withdraw, and the Jews were then responsible for an ignominious Armistice. There followed a period of degradation and reprisals, culminating in the oppressive treaty of Versailles, which was also dictated by international Jewry and a debauched Democracy. Then came the years of chaos, economic and political frustration, moral and public corruption, inflation and all the rest that Germany suffered. All these ills were directly traceable

to the well-laid plotting of Jews and other internationalists. But God raised up from the common people a great and resolute man; his name was Adolf Hitler. He had suffered with his fellow countrymen; he had fought on the field of battle; he had returned to a broken Germany and had become imbued with a divine determination to lead the children of the Fatherland, like Moses of old, out of the wilderness into the Promised Land—into the day of destiny which was Germany's right, but which had been denied it by the Jews and the democracies. (Monotonous refrain!) The story then proceeds with the recital of Hitler's triumphs, as corroboration of the divinity of his mission.

For many a child, the only messiah he knows is this contemporary deliverer, directly sent of God. I have been in homes where little children have been taught to offer grace at table in words like these:

"We thank thee, Oh Fuehrer, that thou hast been sent of God to grant us and our nation our daily bread this day."

Shortly after my arrival in Germany, when Hitler had been in power only six months, I saw proudly displayed in a newspaper the picture of a church bell into which the physiognomy of Hitler had been molded, so that every time it would ring, it would ring the call of the new Messiah to the chosen people.

If one were to ask an average German whether Hitler had replaced Christ in his loyalties, he would probably reply with some exasperation, "No, of course, not." The vast majority of his followers still are nominal Christians, but to all intents and purposes they have appropriated a new savior. It is Hitler, not Christ, who is in their consciousness hour by hour, and whose will, for them and their nation, really dictates their personal and group decisions.

Secondly, National Socialism is a religion in its *body of doctrine*. Probably every religion, sooner or later, develops its creeds and theology, written or handed down from father to son. It is common knowledge that National Socialism has a holy scripture as definitely as any religion that exists. The Party platform, the writings of Hitler, Rosenberg and others, are a part of the intellectual equipment of every young German.

But the amazing fact is the rigid lodgment of the doctrine in the minds of the people. If one were to compare the knowledge of the average National Socialist concerning the grounds of his National Socialism with the knowledge of the average Christian concerning the grounds of

his Christian faith, the Christian would usually reveal himself to be woefully ignorant by comparison. The National Socialist knows his scripture, chapter and verse. He can quote Hitler backwards and forwards. Many a time I have seen a German who was striving to hold to his Christian position in argument with an ardent National Socialist of perhaps similar ability, and almost every time the Christian protagonist would be backed against the wall simply because he did not know as cogently what it means to be a Christian as the National Socialist knew what it means to be a National Socialist. Obviously, the longer the process of National Socialism continues, the less is the opportunity for the younger generation to learn anything except the officially accepted doctrine. Brought up with blinders before their eyes, and constantly subjected to one stream of thought, it is too much to expect that they should not become National Socialists. As a supposedly objective American, and a would-be Christian, I found it difficult to resist the constant pressure of subtle indoctrination.

In the third place, National Socialism is a religion in *the absoluteness of its loyalty*. Probably it is a characteristic of every high religion that it demands devotion on the part of its adherents. If any qualitative comparison is possible, it is difficult to imagine a more complete commitment than that of the true National Socialist to his Germanic faith. I shall never forget an incident with a friend at Heidelberg. He was a remarkable student and a splendid companion, but an ardent National Socialist. He had a particular professor whom he greatly loved. I recall how, from time to time, he would take occasion to extol the virtues of this man. One day the student came to me in great perplexity. I could see that he was deeply troubled. He finally said:

"I don't know what to do. We have just discovered that this professor whom I admire so much is a quarter Jewish. I know through National Socialism that the Jews are the enemies, the potential destroyers, of my people."

We talked at length, but he held to his point:

"I must do all in my power to bring about the dismissal of this professor from the University."

The process was simple. The student appeared at the door of the classroom the next morning, and as the others came to hear their customary lecture he informed them that the professor was non-Aryan and that they should not patronize his course. Either through conviction or fear

of condemnation, not a single student entered the classroom. Not only this day, but the next and the next, until at the end of a week the professor had been completely boycotted in all his courses. He had no alternative but to resign from the University, and the student had won his objective. The significant fact is what the boy said to me before he made his decision:

"We have a system here at Heidelberg whereby if a professor is dismissed or if, for any reason, his work is invalidated, all the work that the students have done with that professor is likewise invalidated, and they are obligated to go back and do it all over again. Not only do I hate to betray my love for this man, but it will mean that I will have to repeat anywhere from three to five semesters of my college course. But I am ready to do it; I believe this thing."

Those four concluding words are the key to the total life of millions of youth in Germany today: "I believe this thing." On the occasion I report, I could not but examine my conscience and ask myself how many American students had anything at all—whether Democracy, or freedom, or their Christian faith, or anything else, in which they believed sufficiently to make this kind of sacrifice on its behalf. Beneath all the impersonal program of colossal armament and regimentation, beneath the grandiose schemes of world conquest, this personal loyalty is the final driving force. It is devotion to a great objective that has given to life a meaning and a dignity worthy of self-denial. It is a lifting of the individual into purposeful identification with the larger community of his fellows, all bound together by their divinely given mission.

Or again, it is a religion in that it has its *church*. Most religions develop a fellowship, a community of the faithful, a focus of expression for all who share the common belief. One of the functions of this community is worship. It is difficult to conceive of a deeper experience of perverted worship than that which is daily induced at meetings of National Socialists all over the Reich, or indeed, today, all over Europe.

These ecstatic gatherings are great and small. Some are restricted to members of the Party, others are explicitly intended to reach the larger public. In my own experience, I have participated in demonstrations ranging in size from a few hundred persons to an estimated million and a half. The basic pattern is the same. The sessions are usually long. There is an intermixture of music in all its uses, pagan liturgies, prayers addressed to the God of the Volk and the Fuehrer, speaking choirs, re-

sponsive readings, inflammatory or reverent speeches, prayers of ascription to Hitler, oaths of fealty.

On special occasions the emotion is particularly intense. It is usually a meeting of vast proportions, probably out of doors. A great tribune is erected at the edge or the center of an open field. From the tribune come the strains of the music and the leadership of the liturgy and all the special pageantry of the occasion. The crowd is gradually aroused to a fever pitch of expectant excitement. Something climactic is about to happen. It becomes a reality when a spotlight pierces the center of the stage, and into the spotlight struts the figure of Adolf Hitler or someone slightly lower in the hierarchy. The mass of people can no longer contain itself. In paroxysms of enthusiasm, they shout "Heil Hitler" till they are red in the face; they throw their hats in the air; they pound one another on the back; they crowd for a closer view.

And so it continues. With a knowledge of mass psychology such as the world has never seen, that great crowd of people is molded into a single expressional unit. The individual person completely loses his identity. He is carried out of himself into a higher presence. He is at worship. I myself, on such occasions, have had to restrain myself as with physical force and remind myself what was taking place.

It is out of an experience like this that community comes. Identification with one another in such an overwhelming emotional field day is enough to give heart to the weakest man and to strike terror into the man who still would resist. It is direct from such experiences that thousands of starry-eyed German lads march straight to the field of battle. Doubtless the conditioning is frequently repeated in the days of inactivity behind the lines. Here are some lessons in worship that hold much of warning.

As a fifth religious manifestation, we have an *elusive subjectivity* that is perhaps the most insidious characteristic of all. National Socialism in its essence is not so much an intellectual formulation as it is a personal faith. It is ready to use the intellectual process as far as this serves its purpose, but when this breaks down it is not embarrassed. On the contrary, it openly proclaims its blind obedience to forces which it does not try to understand.

On numerous occasions it has been my lot to point out inconsistencies in the total structure of the National Socialist idea. The unvarying rejoinder runs something like this: "But you don't understand National

Socialism. We don't claim to have a water-tight philosophy of life. We don't try to explain it all. We give ourselves to it, in faith and obedience, as you give yourself to your Christian religion. Do you understand everything in Christianity? Would you attempt to explain it all? We in Germany are tired of rationalization. That is the hallmark of the Weimar Republic. Where did that get us? No, today we are ready to be told. We want to obey, to follow, to live and even to die for our faith—our faith in Germany and in Hitler. At least in dying there will be a meaning and purpose. Don't ask us to explain all this!"

Here is a religious phenomenon that is extremely difficult to combat. It never can be met by the mind alone. It is rooted so deep in the recent history of the German nation, and in the attendant emotional conditioning of the German people, that it has been used as the cornerstone of Hitler's enterprise. It can be met only by a faith that is stronger, and by thoroughgoing answers to the problems from which it has sprung.

Finally, National Socialism is a religion in its *missionary purpose*. This applies, first of all, to individuals. I never have seen a Christian evangelist more determined to win a convert than countless German friends who have sought to convert me to National Socialism. They literally inquire about the state of your soul. If you still exist in the outer darkness of unbelief, you are a permanent subject for evangelization. It is a day of great rejoicing when you have finally seen the light, confessed your sins and ignorance and wholly embraced the faith. This is not exaggeration, and it certainly is not humor. It is perhaps the greatest tragedy of present-day Germany.

This missionary zeal finds its most amazing expression not in individuals but in the avowed and articulate policy of the Party—and through the Party, of the State. It cannot be said too often and too forcefully that the dynamic heart of National Socialism is the "Volk." It is not possible here to dissect this concept, which means infinitely more than any approximate translation such as the "People," the "Nation" or the "Race." Perhaps it is precisely because the word itself has no exact counterpart in English that the idea behind it has not been fully grasped by the Anglo-Saxon peoples.

At least one characteristic of the doctrine of the "Volk" must be made crystal clear to Christians everywhere: that it is both exclusive and inclusive in character. It is exclusive in the sense that only those who

possess all the sacred qualities of true Germanic blood can be members of the mystic community. It is allegedly for this reason that the Jew is extraneous to the German culture. There are many scholarly treatises, even by eminent Christian theologians, in support of this theory. It is not caprice or whimsy that has dictated the treatment of the Jew, so the argument runs. There is a mysterious body of evidence to show why this is necessary. As a matter of fact, we Germans have been generous in permitting the Jew to remain as a guest among us for as many centuries as he has. Now our eyes have been opened. Thanks to Adolf Hitler, we see what needs to be done, by whatever means prove necessary. And the quicker the better!

This specious reasoning, rooted in a Chosen People complex, militates not only against the Jew. It also means that Germany, so long as this is her official policy, will face insuperable problems of ideology as well as of simple administration in reordering Europe according to her particular racial view. This is one of the many reasons why National Socialist Germany, regardless of its military and economic domination, never will be really accepted as the ruler of Europe.

We are led at this point to face the character of this "Volkseinheit" as not only exclusive, but as inclusive, in its outlook. We must remember that the membership of the "Volk" is not restricted to the present bounds of the German Reich. Indeed, it is here that the missionary character of National Socialism reveals its true significance. The Nation of Germans transcends the lines of existing States in just as logical a manner as does the ecumenical Church. Once the basic concept is granted, why indeed should it not? It is a transcendent community, established of God, now in dispersion but definitely awaiting deliverance and mystic reunion. What human plan could be more nearly divine than the Hitlerian plan to set right the disarranged miscarriage of creation?

So first the Saar and then the Anschluss, and then the German minorities who had to be rescued in the Sudetenland, Memel, the Corridor, not to mention Slovakia, Yugoslavia, Transylvania—and the Ukraine! Still on the list are those in Latin America, Chicago, Hoboken and points around the world. This is not fantastic. It fits together to perfection. The means to be employed, whether military, economic or otherwise, are of secondary importance. The important fact is that this dynamic, mystical religion, rooted in a particular assumption about a "Volk," has been the

cornerstone from which has been erected one of the most unbelievable undertakings of all history. A gigantic program of political and economic expansion, with all its accompaniments of military might, has been made possible by the prostitution of an essentially missionary impulse.

Lest this appear bizarre, let us illustrate. I happened to be in Germany in the period after Munich when the Germans were agitating for a further occupation of Bohemia and Moravia, beyond the Sudetenland. This was one of the few times I can recall when the German people as a whole were manifestly restive and uncertain under Hitler's leadership. "Why," they asked, "does the Fuehrer want to go farther? We are united with our 'Volksgenossen' in the Sudetenland. That is what we wanted. Might not a further advance mean war? Surely Hitler would not lead us into war!"

What was the trouble? The chief propaganda which had sold the Germans was unity with their fellow Germans in the Sudetenland. For the sake of this principle they were ready to take necessary risks. But so intense had been the concentration on the Sudetenland that they had been temporarily permitted to forget the German minorities in the farther reaches of central and southeastern Europe. This, however, was rapidly rectified. In a swift campaign through radio and press, Doctor Goebbels made up magnificently for the oversight, and once again the German people were reconciled to the continuance of their work—for the glorious rescue of the "Volk"!

Thus in diabolical fashion a cardinal missionary principle in a new religion has been made the justification and the dynamic for a grandiose plan of world conquest. This world adventure might never have been sold to the majority of the German people in its honest garb, but from step to step they began to realize that they had gone too far to turn back.

Today, with the very existence of their nation at stake, it is quite understandable that even those who have been duped should fight to the death. There are millions who fight because of the religious passion with which they have been imbued. There are millions of others who fight not fanatically but because they soberly feel that this is the only course consistent with honor and justice and patriotism. There are millions more who fight for simple self-preservation. But behind them all, the religion has admirably performed the first phase of its work—to launch the people on what they now are doing. And it continues today

to provide more of the dynamic for the total effort than we can measure. It is nonetheless religious because of its amazing spiritual contradictions—its satanic mixture of worship and contempt, obedience and irresponsibility, solidarity and brutality, self-abnegation and hate.

If National Socialism has become a religious reality to millions of Germans, it can be ultimately dealt with only in religious terms. It is true that we must overthrow National Socialism to establish the conditions out of which the minds and souls of the German people can be released and reached. But this is only the negative beginning of our task. We must establish the kind of a world society in which the legitimate spiritual aspirations of all peoples, German and otherwise, have a chance of being met. We must make National Socialism and all similar perversions unnecessary. If National Socialism is partly the result of a particular set of human frustrations, it is with those frustrations that we must deal. So long as they remain, the grounds for the religion remain. The military effort is not enough. We cannot bomb a religion out of the heart of a people, nor bayonet a new one into them.

The responsibility of every Christian leader in America is to look at the spiritual facts of National Socialism and apply them rigorously to his own area of experience. Let him not escape by castigating Hitler, diabolical though Hitler may be. One could go back over each of the six religious factors we have mentioned and test himself and his parishioners—not German Christians, but American Christians—on every point. He could learn from the triumphs of Hitler.

For the great internal enemy of the Church is the same in America as it was in Germany—the failure to understand Christianity. From this lack of understanding springs lack of faith and practice, and the consequent hazard of rival claims on the loyalty of the individual Christian. If times grow really stringent in America, if forces comparable to National Socialism begin to grow articulate, who would dare to prophesy that the Church in America is any more spiritually secure than was the Church in Germany? The chances are strong that we would be split from top to bottom. It would not be a political division, with the appeasers against the resisters, or the “pro-Germans” against the “patriots.” This might be one of its outward forms, but the basic issue, cutting across denominations and classes and races and politics and the size of our bank accounts, would be infinitely more terrible: What does it mean to be a Christian?

Remember that most of the people of Germany still regard themselves as Christians—those who worship Hitler and those who oppose him! Similarly some Americans would glory in a Hitler if he were in the White House, and they are probably members of our Churches!

With this in view, there are certainly five crucial warnings which come to us out of Germany. We can only barely name them. First of all, we must be *sound in our Christian message*. We must know what Christianity is. This presupposes no one theology against another, but it does require a clear understanding of the inner meaning of the gospel. Men must get it in larger measure from the Bible itself. They must be helped to understand the difference between being a Christian and not being one.

They must not only know the grounds of their faith, but they must know the character of the world in which their faith is to be tested. They must learn to see that the Christian message and the world environment are interrelated, that the Good News of the Gospel is to be preached in the midst of men, not in a vacuum. It can be neither a message of capitulation to the world on the one side, nor of escape from the world on the other. It must give fiber to the souls of men until they are conquerors through Christ. It must be rooted and grounded in a new resort to worship. These are things which the Confessional Church of Germany has discovered and proclaimed through tribulation. To be a Christian has come to have a meaning.

Equally urgent, we must be *aggressive in evangelization*. When one thinks of what happened to Germany, and then of the millions similarly in America to whom the Church is only a name, one is filled with great disquiet. If there were to arise in this land a vigorous and purposeful paganism, hitched to the magic star of a great new order for America, how strong would we be to withstand it? It is not to discredit the glorious witness that has been borne by the churches of America in many critical periods, to say that we have not yet had to face what the Christians of Germany have faced so valiantly. Only on the solid rock of a faith that is irrepressible and hence self-multiplying can we build the structure of a mighty Church.

We must be *unshakable in our sense of community*. One of the greatest sins of Christian people has been their self-sufficiency in human relationships. While it is the glory of the gospel of Christ that it lends a

dignity and meaning to the individual as the child of God, it is equally a part of the gospel that a Christian alone is incomplete. He is part of a community of believers, and attains full spiritual stature only in this context. The world about him may be full of sin, and the Church itself may be full of sinners, but he can fulfill his Christian destiny only in relation to the Christian community and to the larger world in which it is set. He must be a community Christian in the midst of an unchristian community.

This sense of identity with a larger self is the triumph of the Church in Germany and in Europe at large today. Formerly this was not so. Martin Dibelius, of Germany, recently has written, "The German Evangelical Churches have been too much a religious authority and too little a Christian brotherhood." But now the sense of community has become the point of departure, the bastion of resistance, the assurance of victory. Transcending all differences of theology and race and nation and class and "isms," it is a must for the Church in America.

Americans uniquely still have the chance, with relative impunity, to be *prophetic in social action*. While the Church has a special character as a community, it is of the essence of that community that it reaches out to the rest of life. One of the basic human impulses which has given rise to National Socialism is the urge to solidarity. What conceivable community can compare with the Christian Church in its transcendence of human barriers? If the Church is to show the way to human brotherhood, it must demonstrate community not only in itself, but it must lay the spiritual foundations and make the practical beginnings of a wider love among men. In the burning issue of race, does the Church in America have anything to say to Germany? Let it be noted that once the Christians of Germany had come to understand what they had allowed to happen in regard to the Jews, many of them repented and are now trying to make amends. Let not the Churches in America lock the door after the horse is stolen!

Or look at solidarity in relation to the masses. At the bottom of National Socialism, and indeed of all the modern political faiths, is a new self-awareness on the part of the worker and the unemployed. National Socialism has been a tragic prostitution of the true desires of the masses, but it has climbed the ladder of their genuine aspirations to its own ambitious goal. And let us be wide awake to the emergence of labor

as a force in America itself! The spiritual movement which gives genuine release to the masses will be in the stream of history, and certainly in the path of Christ. To race and class must be added the question of the State, and many others. We are confronted with immediate areas of desperate human conflict in which the Church in America dares not be silent.

Finally, we must be *indefatigable in our world task*. If any lesson is clear, it is that the world is crying for unity. Beneath the din of battle on all fronts in this tragic war is the ironic fact of men's passionate longing for peace and order. The great disparity in their views as to what that order should be arises from one simple fact: The lack of a common moral basis, a world ethos, a unifying direction and purpose and spiritual sanction sufficiently strong to transcend their manifold differences. Anyone who has attended secular international conferences and Christian international conferences cannot but have sensed that these two types of experience typify the basic problem. In the one there is no common cement to hold men together; in the other, there is.

The Church can show the way, if only it will. Every member of the Church should be made to feel his membership in the Church Universal. It is not the American faith, or the German faith, but the Christian faith, which he avows. In missions, in succor, in reconciliation, in fellowship, in worship, in the offering of ecumenical Christians for the service of the world community—in these and other expressions the Church can prove itself the nucleus and the inspiration of true world brotherhood. It is at the point of its universality, perhaps more than at any other, that it stands in sharp contrast to the religion of the National Socialists. Here again, the movement of Adolf Hitler has raised into sharp relief the uniqueness of the nature and task of the Church of Christ. Here again, it is for the Church itself to decide whether it will heed the lessons so poignantly learned by our brethren in Germany and now vividly offered to the rest of Christendom.

Let us, therefore, recognize National Socialism for what it is—a major threat to the Christian Church. Let us stand against it, by whatever means God shows us to be right. But let us look well to our own obedience, building strong the life of the Church, rooted solid in the Rock of our Salvation. To uproot a faith that is false is of little importance except as we plant the gospel that is true.

The Organist's Function in Worship

SETH BINGHAM

ANY intelligent consideration of the role of the organist in worship—meaning for our present purposes worship in American Protestant churches—must take into account a number of factors. How long has the organ been in existence, what are its history and characteristics and what are its uses in solo and accompaniment during service? When did composers begin to write for the organ, and what music have they composed? The organist, his training, attitude and duties, his relations to his minister and congregation—these are further factors which must be thoughtfully surveyed.

THE ORGAN: ITS ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT

We all have a fairly clear idea of the modern organ as an instrument of keys, wind and pipes. Some of us will have read that "hydraulic" organs existed even before the beginning of the Christian era; and there are records of air-blown organs as far back as the year 600 A. D., at which time the hydraulic organ seems to have disappeared. From works of art (mosaics, statues, carvings, paintings, tapestries, stained glass and illuminated parchments) supplemented by letters, histories and ecclesiastical records, we can fairly conjecture what the organs of the thirteenth century were like. We know that there were three types of medieval organs: the so-called *portatif* (portable), the *positif* (stationary) and the *grand orgue*, an enlargement of the *positif*. The *portatif* probably came first. It was fastened by shoulder straps to the player who worked a bellows with the left hand and "keys" with the right. Pictures show eight to sixteen pipes, the tallest measuring two to three feet. The *positif*, fixed on a stand or table, allowing the performer to use both hands, had more pipes, one or two keyboards and a more extended compass than the *portatif*. The *grand orgue*, really a primitive type of the organ as we know it, came into very general use during the fourteenth century. It boasted some thirty keys and a compass of three octaves. During the fifteenth century there was notable progress in the development of pipe-work, chests, bellows and couplers, in the creation of different planes of sonority and in the gradual extension of the keyboard. As early as 1429

the organ at Amiens numbered 2,500 pipes ranging from three inches to twelve feet in length. By 1475 there were instruments with pipes twenty-four feet long, and organs were constructed in "stories," one section above the other.

The Renaissance epoch (roughly 1480 to 1580) witnessed extensive organ-building activity in France, Germany and other parts of Europe, with a larger variety of flutes, reeds and "mixtures." It was a period of extraordinary growth and transition. During the "classic" age (1575-1650) organ building flourished greatly; the type of instrument was standardized and fixed within clearly defined limits. In the tonal "build-up" of the classic organ the seventeenth-century artisans achieved a fine balance of sonority never since surpassed, affording a maximum of clarity, volume and carrying power. The late seventeenth century German organ inspired in Bach the most perfect tone-poems ever written for the organ. (It was the writer's privilege to examine one of these instruments, still in an excellent state of preservation, in the Eosander Chapel at Charlottenburg, shortly before the outbreak of the present war.) As far as tone and ensemble are concerned, nothing vitally essential has been discovered or invented since that golden age over 250 years ago. The amazing thing is that they reached this level of perfection so early and so completely—until we remember that the flowering of this subtle art came after a gradual, cumulative growth covering nearly five centuries.

The art of organ building reached its culmination between 1680 and 1715. Instruments with five manuals and over sixty stops were not uncommon in the eighteenth century; some remain practically intact today. With the introduction of electric action in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the organ's tonal design underwent a change for the worse. A paucity of good mixtures, too many "tubby" flutes, "hooty" diapasons, "blary" tubas and crude imitations of orchestral *timbre* characterized these monstrosities. Within the past fifteen years there has been a return to the saner classic design of the seventeenth century. The best modern instruments may be said to be based on the classic model, but include certain "solo" registers and "string" ensembles of later invention.

Church architects are not always musicians or even expert acousticians. Far too often they relegate the organ to well-nigh hermetic chambers where most of its natural beauty and tonal color is lost. Moreover, the church auditorium must have resonance; plenty of stone or

wooden surfaces to reflect and distribute the sound waves. A thickly carpeted church floor is the deadly enemy of musical tone. The removal of carpets and relocation of improperly hidden pipework will usually effect a wonderful improvement.

LITERATURE OF THE ORGAN

Since the organ from earliest time has been devoted mainly to the service of the Church, it is only natural that a large share of organ literature—i. e., music written expressly for the instrument—should find its source and inspiration in Gregorian chant and in the psalms, canticles and hymns of the Christian liturgy. We find this to be true from the first-known beginnings in organ composition. There is in fact considerable evidence to prove that vocal motets or accompanied chants by such fifteenth-century composers as Josquin des Prés (1450-1521), John Dunstable (d. 1453) and Ludwig Senfl (c. 1492-1555) were frequently played as organ solos, while presumably pure organ works by Jacob Obrecht (c. 1430-1505), Heinrich Isaak (1455-1517) and Paul Hofhaimer (1459-1537) are almost invariably based on a liturgical text, hardly ever exceed vocal limits, and might just as well be sung as played. In the year 1531, however, Pierre Attaingnant published in Paris a remarkable collection of original music for keyed instruments, including three books of organ music. These contain two purely instrumental settings of the Mass (Kyrie, Gloria, Credo, Sanctus, Agnus Dei), the Magnificat in the eight modes, a Te Deum and two Preludes. Somewhat naïve in rhythm and harmonic color, these pieces, with all due allowance for the limitations of the organ of their day, show a definite instrumental approach to the technique of organ composition, and several carry a musical message of truly expressive beauty.

It is only with the technical improvement of the organ as a vehicle of artistic expression that church composers begin to be attracted to its possibilities. In Spain, Antonio de Cabezon (1510-1566), the illustrious organist of Philip II, produced noble and austere pieces on Gregorian themes, *versillos*, or short preludes, variations and *tientos* (extended preludes). In Italy, Andrea Gabrieli (1510-1586) contributed much to the advance in the art of organ music, while Girolamo Frescobaldi (1583-1643), renowned as a virtuoso, gave us his "Fiori Musicali" with fresh and novel treatment of the canzona, the ricercare and the toccata. The

fantasias of the Netherlands composer, Jan Pieter Sweelinck (1562-1621) are in the repertory of every good performer. Two other great figures of this epoch share a commanding position with Cabezón and Frescobaldi: they are Jean Titelouze (1563-1633) and Samuel Scheidt (1587-1654). Titelouze, "the father of organ music in France," left two series of organ pieces: (1) Hymns of the Church (Paris, 1623); (2) the Magnificat or Cantic of the Virgin (Paris, 1626). In style, Titelouze is serious, full of power and dignity; we are moved by the deep conception and mysticism of his works. Samuel Scheidt, called the finest German organist of his time, published in 1624 his *Tablatura Nova*, showing a remarkable solidity of construction and a new use of symbolism. Scheidt is considered the originator of the Protestant Choralvorspiel. Mention should also be made of Michael Praetorius (1571-1621) and Jacob Froberger (16?-17?), a disciple of Frescobaldi.

We trace a growing perfection in organ music closely paralleling that of the instrument itself. The seventeenth century brings a glorious succession of composers culminating in Bach. Nicolas Le Bègue (1630-1702) wrote three books of organ pieces comprising elevations, preludes, *offertoires* and especially his graceful and popular Noëls. François Couperin (c. 1631-1700) composed two great "organ masses," music deceptively perfect in its simplicity, its beauty and variety of mood. Bach copied these with his own hand. Dietrich Buxtehude (1637-1707), the great Danish master, exercised a strong influence on Bach. Buxtehude composed for the organ chaconnes, passacaglias, toccatas, preludes and fugues and a considerable number of Choralvorspiele. His greatest German contemporary was Johann Pachelbel (1653-1706) who shows high technical mastery and poetic insight in his choral preludes, impregnated with mystic fervor and profound piety. Among his pupils was Christoph Bach, the elder brother and teacher of the great Johann Sebastian. Other notable seventeenth-century German composers were Johann Casper Kerl (1627-1693), Georg Muffat (c. 1645-1704), Johann Kuhnau (1660-1722), Bach's predecessor as cantor of the Thomasschule in Leipzig; Georg Böhm (1661-1734) and Johann Gottfried Walter (1684-1748), Bach's contemporary, who specialized in the partita or choral variation.

Louis Marchand (1669-1732), a brilliant French virtuoso who won fame throughout Europe, left organ pieces in the form of *Plein Jeu*, *Fugue*, *Recitative*, *Dialogue*, etc. Bach was acquainted with Marchand's

compositions which he executed with admirable taste and buoyancy. One of the five organ masses by André Raison (16?-17?), organist of St. Etienne du Mont, Paris, contains the original theme of Bach's immortal Passacaglia. Nicolas de Grigny (1671-1703), a pupil of Le Begue and organist of Rheims Cathedral, has left us his fine *Livre d'Orgue* with settings of the mass and four Gregorian hymns. A copy in Bach's handwriting is in the library at Bonn. De Grigny's music is sensitive, deeply felt and highly personal. Two suites by Louis Nicolas Clerambault (1676-1749) impress us with their grace, verve and elegance. Of Pierre Du Mage (16?-17?) little is known beyond a splendid group of organ pieces including a stately *Grand Jeu*. Other gifted seventeenth-century composers in France were Henry Du Mont (1610-1684); Guillaume Gabriel Nivers (1617-1714); Jacques Boyvin (1650-1706); Gilles Julien, organist of Chartres Cathedral from 1663 to 1703; and Jean-François Dandrieu (1684-1769). Henry Purcell (c. 1658-1695), genius of the Elizabethan era in English music and organist of Westminster Abbey, exercised a very considerable influence on Handel.

The advent of Bach marks a lofty summit of achievement in organ literature never yet surpassed. Bach brings us a supreme synthesis of the various schools of preceding masters, a sublimation of their ideals and practices. On the intimate side stand his choral-preludes, miniature tone poems based on Gregorian chant, Latin hymns and Lutheran chorales. "These organ preludes, really small oratorios without words, form a mystic commentary replete with a meaning suggested by the absent words." The structural details of Bach's more purely architectural creations—his fantasias, preludes, fugues and toccatas—frequently bear a striking resemblance to those of his choral-preludes and place these grandiose works definitely within the realm of liturgical music. They remain in spite of their highly involved technique and elaborate counterpoint, what doubtless Bach intended them to be: paeans of praise and adoration, pious rhythms of jubilation, petition, lamentation, faith, hope; fervent prayers of contrition, of confidence—invariably inscribed "to the glory of God."

Contemporary with Bach or closely following him come George Frederic Handel (1685-1759) who wrote several concertos and other organ works; Louis-Claude D'Aquin (1694-1772), whose vivacious and sparkling Noël's have preserved their freshness and vitality down to our own day; and Claude Balbastre (1727-1799), organist of Notre Dame.

Two of Bach's sons, Wilhelm Friedemann and Carl Philip Emmanuel, left valuable organ works. Then there is a lull. Mozart composed very little for the organ; Haydn, Schubert and Beethoven nothing. It remained for Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy (1809-1847) to revive interest in the music of Bach and to carry on the tradition with three preludes and fugues and six sonatas for organ. Robert Schumann (1810-1856) contributed six sketches and six fugues on the name BACH; Franz Liszt (1811-1886), his famous BACH fugue and his fantasy and fugue on the choral "Ad nos, ad salutarem undam"; and Johannes Brahms (1833-1897) his Eleven Choral-Preludes. Joseph Rheinberger (1839-1901) is remembered for his Pastoral Sonata and Sonata in G minor. The compositions of Max Reger, once hailed as a second Bach, prove with the test of time to be rather heavy-handed *pasticcios* lacking the divine spark of the great Cantor. Sigfrid Karg-Elert (1877-1933), though prolific and colorful, has left little of permanent value.

By far the most important contribution to nineteenth century organ literature comes from Cesar Franck (1822-1890), who has given us the great Six Pieces, the *Pièce Heroïque* and above all the three superb Chorals, bold and advanced in their treatment of form and color. Alexandre Guilmant (1837-1901) rendered a signal service to organists through his reverent editions of sixteenth-, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century masters. Charles-Marie Widor (1844-1938) enlarged and expanded the technical resources of the art with organ works of a symphonic character. Louis Vierne (1870-1937) follows similar lines in his splendid organ symphonies and *genre* pieces. Several organ compositions by Camille Saint-Saëns (1835-1921) are entirely suitable for sacred use. Charles Tournemire (1870-1939), Franck's successor at Sainte Clothilde, Paris, produced among other works a series of pieces covering the entire cycle of the church year, entitled "L'Orgue Mystique," much of it revealing distinct beauty and originality. Others of the nineteenth-century French school include Theodore Dubois (1837-1924); Eugene Gigout (1844-1925); Leon Boellmann (1862-1897) and Guy Ropartz (1864-).

Contemporary figures in French organ composition are Henri Mulet (b. 1878), composer of the Byzantine Sketches and Carillon-Sortie; Joseph Bonnet (b. 1884), world famous organist of St. Eustache, Paris, whose recital tours have exerted a tremendous influence for good on the American organ profession; Marcel Dupré (b. 1886), Widor's brilliant successor

at St. Sulpice, whose best-known works are his preludes and fugues, *Vêpres du Commun*, *Passion Symphony* and *Chemin de la Croix*. Among the remarkable younger generation we note André Fleury (b. 1903), Maurice Durufé (b. 1903), Jean Langlais (b. 1907), the accomplished composer of *Mors et Resurrectio* and *Poèmes Evangeliques*; the "revolutionary" Olivier Messiaen (b. 1908); Gaston Litaize (b. 1909) and Jehan Alain (b. 1911), a young composer of rare poetic gifts.¹

The Belgian composer Paul de Maleingreau (b. 1887) numbers among his organ works three symphonies and other important music. In Holland, Flor Peeters (b. 1903) is credited with ten Organ Chorals and a Toccata, Hymn and Fugue on the "Ave Maris Stella." The Swiss organist, Henry Mottu, has given us several books of Liturgical Pieces of great sensitivity and finesse. Vaughan Williams, Percy Whitlock and Robin Milford in England, and Healy Willan in Canada, all have done excellent work. Contemporary German organ music appears at a low ebb. The four sonatas by Paul Hindemith betray a defective knowledge of the organ and are devoid of spirituality. In America, notable organ music has been written by Edward Shippen Barnes (b. 1887), Joseph Clokey (b. 1890), Garth Edmundson (b. 1896), a composer of unusual talent; Bruce Simonds (b. 1895), and Leo Sowerby (b. 1895), creator of *Carillon*, *Requiescat in Pace*, a symphony and suite, etc., whose powerful individual style marks him as a composer of the first rank.

If we have dwelt at some length on this survey it is to call attention to the extraordinary richness and varied resources at our disposal in the realm of pure organ music, most of it having an intimate connection with our religious worship and answering our present-day needs.

THE ORGANIST: HIS ATTITUDE AND TRAINING

The organist's approach to his art should be one of consecration; he must be in love with his task. Whatever policy toward its organist the church may pursue, be it strictly "business," truly Christian or a mixture of the two, the organist must find his highest reward in the satisfaction of devoted service rendered. Any organist worth his salt will gladly do for his church a thousand and one things he is not paid to do. The organist should be a "man of God" in the Christian sense; one can scarcely conceive the irreligious or unbelieving type of artist exercising

¹ Killed in action in the present war.

his musical ministry with any permanent degree of happiness or success. (This is not to say that an organist must believe in total immersion in order effectively to preside over the musical destinies of a Baptist flock.) His study of the Bible, hymnody and church ritual should be thorough and constant. Technically and aesthetically the organist's education must necessarily entail years of arduous preparation which he should willingly undertake. He ought to be a person of broad cultural outlook and warm humanity with a liking for his fellow men; pictures and architecture should attract him; whenever possible he should travel. He ought to be and frequently is a leader of musical culture in his community. The exercise of good taste should not turn him into an aesthetic snob, nor on the other hand should he lower his standards to curry favor with those who show themselves moronic in their own tastes, any more than the preacher should stoop to cheap methods to gain the interest of his hearers.

This brings us quite naturally to the relation of the minister to his organist. Most clergymen will doubtless agree that the courses in music appreciation, hymnody and voice production now available to divinity students through institutions like the School of Sacred Music at Union Theological Seminary or the Westminster Choir College at Princeton, go far toward laying the groundwork for better mutual understanding, for fuller and more effective collaboration between minister and organist. The latter, if wise, plans his music far ahead and will naturally wish to consult with his minister. In Episcopal churches the rector has final and absolute authority in musical matters, so that these periodic conferences are generally held as a matter of course. Moreover, the responsibilities are clearly fixed and the organist can be sure where he stands. In non-liturgical churches the music committee often plays an active part and the responsibilities are not always so clearly fixed, thus making for confusion, misunderstanding and unnecessary friction. But no rigid system of musical control for all denominations is possible or desirable; in the long run the success or failure of a church's musical ministry must depend on the individual. The late Mark Andrews was fond of telling how Doctor Fosdick who was then Andrews' pastor used to exclaim, "Mark, we're a great team!" From a personal knowledge of both men I can appreciate what this meant in uplift and inspiration to the congregation whose good fortune it was to be served by such a "team."

The organist of a great church or cathedral in Paris, presiding over

his mighty instrument in a gallery high above the nave, will not ordinarily come into personal touch with any of his congregation excepting those whose culture and genuine love of music may procure them access to the organ loft. There, surrounded by pupils and admirers, the organist reigns in a sort of kingly splendor. His artistic renown is considerable, his only contact with his parishioners is that established through the message of his music. There is something to be said for this aloofness. In America the organist is most often accorded a social status somewhere between the pastor and the janitor. More often than not, organists in American churches are underpaid, sometimes disgracefully so. Unlike orchestral and other professional musicians, they are not unionized. "There is no closed season on organists" is the saying, and some churches hire and fire their organist with a hard-boiled "business" abandon that verges on the unchristian. In this connection it may be of interest to hear the opinion of the chairman of the American Guild of Organists' committee on ethics, Professor Samuel A. Baldwin, who writes in the *Diapason* for June, 1941, as follows:

"It would be very difficult to get the governing bodies of the churches to legislate on the status and tenure of organists, as the control of music is in the hands of the individual churches. . . . However, any discussion of the matter would be helpful, and it might be possible to bring it before these church bodies. We might find friends at court, or they might be willing to listen to an accredited representative. . . . In enforcing our code we have not a legal leg to stand on. We cannot deny to churches the right to change organists. All we can ask is that the hardship of such a change should be reduced to a minimum by adequate notice. . . . As to pensions, they could be won only after a long, hard fight. . . . The present woefully inadequate pay of most organists does not offer a base for a fair pension. A pension system, to be a success, must be on an actuarial basis, with contributions from both employer and employee. There should be a general fund for each church body; otherwise there would be no security for the organist if he changed positions from one body to another."

If the organist is so poorly paid that he must devote the best part of his time and energy to outside or even nonmusical activities in order to live, then his "service" value to his church is apt to be correspondingly poor and disappointing. A clause in Doctor Williamson's "Westminster

plan" of musical ministry which has scored marked success in building up church membership, stipulates that the church's music budget equal the minister's salary.

In Protestant churches in England and America, the dual functions of organist and choirmaster are usually combined in one person. This has its advantages and its drawbacks. In a sense it may promote unity and smoothness of routine to vest all control in a single directing head. Technically and artistically, however, this arrangement is far from ideal, since the organist must divide his attention between playing his instrument and directing the choir; one or the other is liable to suffer. The organist-director must frequently conduct with one hand, while making out as best he can with the other hand and his feet. When this is skilfully done the average person in the congregation is not even aware of it. Vigorous head nods and shoulder movements, even facial contortions—better unseen by the congregation—may usefully supplement actual hand-conducting. But there are moments when the organist must attend strictly to his accompaniment, involving at times rapid changes of dynamics and registration. Then he must leave the choir to shift for themselves and rely on good rehearsal preparation to ensure their carrying out the composer's rhythmic and coloristic intentions. The results are not always satisfactory. Doctor John Finley Williamson, director of the Westminster Choir College, considers it more effective to have a conductor who is a voice and choral specialist to direct both organist and choir. This principle has been bitterly opposed for obvious reasons by certain organist-choirmasters, many of whom are noticeably deficient in vocal and choral technique. They are apt to regard the choir as a necessary evil and choir training as a lefthanded job. For the same reasons they condemn the use of a cappella music, despite the fact that more than half of the world's greatest church music—to mention only such supreme masters as Machaut, Dufay, Perotin, Gombert, Josquin, Palestrina, Vittoria, Lassus, Byrd, Weelkes, Goudimel, Gabrieli, Schütz, Purcell and Bach—was written to be sung without accompaniment. As a beneficent by-product of the Williamson campaign for better choral music, many an organist has taken up the serious study of vocal and choral training with a resultant gain for himself and the church he serves.

Since the ritual of Episcopal worship follows a definite pattern governed by the Church seasons, the task of planning the music and play-

ing the service becomes relatively simple. But in Presbyterian, Baptist, Methodist, Congregational and numerous other denominations, the order of service varies with each individual parish, and the chance to make or mar the musical worship is correspondingly greater. The writer has before him service lists from some twenty-five of the nation's prominent churches representing seven different religious sects. No two are identical, but all told they indicate a praiseworthy desire on the part of minister and organist to invest the order of service with a purposeful spirit of devotion.

The service prelude is a favorite subject of controversy among organists, clergy and laymen. Probably the most prevalent idea of the prelude is that it should begin quietly, work up to an emotional climax and taper off to a tranquil close. This sounds reasonable and calculated gently to draw the mind of the worshiper into harmony with the reverent atmosphere of the sanctuary. Certain people like a hearty "peppy" prelude; others prefer something solid, dignified and impersonal. The lowly man in the pew occasionally says, "I'm no musical expert, but I know what I like"; but what he likes may be the Meditation from "Thais" or "Moonlight and Roses." The organist of discriminating taste will be guided in the selection of his prelude by the particular season, Church feast or special occasion. Surely no one would object to a bold and stirring prelude at a Thanksgiving Day service or at Ascensiontide. The Christmas legend gives occasion for the naïve, intimate, bright and playful, Easter for the dazzling and triumphant; the music of Advent preludes may sound a dramatic, prophetic note. Lenten preludes can be meditative, repentant; those of Holy Week dark and tragic. A wealth of beautiful organ music exists to satisfy each of these requirements. Careful study and practice should invariably be given the Sunday morning or evening prelude. A hastily prepared, slovenly prelude is as inexcusable as that kind of sermon. An appropriate prelude beautifully played will already have pointed the service toward spiritual victory.

With the postlude we find ourselves on debatable ground. Go into almost any large and active church in such cities as Chicago, New York or San Francisco. Observe what happens after the benediction. The minister hastens to take his stand in front of the chancel or in the vestibule to greet and shake hands with parishioners and visitors—what more natural? The organist plays a carefully practiced postlude, usually on the

brilliant side, often of impressive length, and not infrequently having a definite spiritual connection with the service. Or he contents himself with a short choral-prelude or extemporizes on some part of the music worship. He may even take care to play lightly so that those who have just knelt, or bowed, for the benediction may now converse freely and audibly with friends and acquaintances. Whatever he does the congregation as a whole will pay him scant attention. They consider the period of worship finished with the benediction or with the choir's final Amen after the Recessional. There are, of course, exceptions, particularly in the Episcopal Church, where it is still possible to see the worshipers filing out quietly or remaining at their devotions until the postlude is ended. As we said, the question of the postlude is a debatable one. There may be good reasons for abolishing the postlude in some churches or under special conditions. Certainly its only justification is spiritual and symbolic as an integral part of the worship.

Organ interludes may be fittingly used at several points in the order of worship. An interlude may lead into the Doxology or Gloria Patri. It may bridge the gap between the prelude and the opening hymn or processional. It may furnish a transition of mood from prayer to anthem. It is sometimes mistakenly used to "fill in" between a prayer and a scripture reading or to "cover" the entrance and seating of latecomers. This dread of silent periods, however short, deprives church worship of its most impressive moments. Some pastors even insist on having intervals of "silent" prayer accompanied by soft music. One has only to note the sublimity of the silence in the Catholic office—as during the elevation of the Host—to be persuaded of the value of silent periods in worship. Interludes may be actual music or improvisations. If the latter, the music should bear some significant relation to the service. Improvisation during communion can greatly heighten the beauty and mystery of the sacrament. The writer has been privileged frequently to hear the greatest exponents of this art. At its finest, improvisation surpasses "composed" music in spontaneity of conception, in warmth and direct appeal.

In the singing of hymns the congregation finds its most vital and tangible outlet for religious emotion. Our greatest hymns combine verses of grand poetic imagery with music which is in every way worthy of the text. Nothing else save prayer succeeds in voicing our innermost aspirations so simply and directly. It would therefore seem self-evident that

this means of congregational participation should assume paramount importance for the organist whose duty it is to play the hymns. But it must be admitted that many are still deficient in this branch of their art. Hymns should be practiced as thoroughly and conscientiously as solo selections or anthem accompaniments. The organist should know words and music practically by heart. He must decide how to introduce the hymn, when to signal the choir to rise, whether the hymn should be sung wholly or partially in unison, whether to transpose it; the suitable tempo and how to maintain it, whether to "paint the lily" in a sentimental hymn or overdramatize a dramatic one, how to treat the Amen. These and many other questions will occur to the alert organist intent on realizing the fullest possibilities of a hymn. Nothing quite equals the thrill of satisfaction for the organist who knows how to lead and inspire his congregation in the singing of a fine hymn.

CONCLUSION

In attempting to give the reader a fair picture of the organist's function in worship we have endeavored to focus his attention on the practical essentials: (1) the organ, its history, evolution and place in our system of worship; (2) the amazingly rich organ literature today available for church use—a literature extending from the fifteenth century to our own time. With these musical treasures at one's disposal, transcriptions of the fleshly and materialistic music of Wagner's operas appear as an absurdity and an abomination in our churches, and the organist need never descend to the cheap and trivial. (3) The organist, his equipment and approach to his calling, his relation to his minister and his congregation, and finally his actual function and duties in the service—all interdependent factors in the exercise of his calling.

Having been active in the church-music field for nearly half a century, first as a choir singer, then as an organist, teacher and director, the writer can look back on a period of tremendous growth and advance in the organ profession, both as regards better musicianship and technique of the organist and increasing perfection of the instrument. The American Guild of Organists was founded in 1896. Its purposes: "To advance the cause of worthy church music, to elevate the status of church organists; to increase their appreciation of their responsibilities, duties and opportunities as conductors of worship. To raise the standard of efficiency of organists

by examinations in organ playing, in the theory of music and in general musical knowledge. To provide members with opportunities for meeting for the discussion of professional topics, and to do such other lawful things as are incidental to the purposes of the Guild." In 1935 the National Association of Organists was merged with the American Guild, which now has about one hundred chapters in the forty-eight states, with over six thousand members. The high idealism of the Guild is further evident in its Declaration of Religious Principles, part of which says: "We believe that the office of music in Christian worship is a sacred obligation before the Most High. We believe that they who are set as choirmasters and as organists in the House of God ought themselves to be persons of devout conduct. We believe that the unity of purpose and fellowship of life between ministers and choirs should be everywhere established and maintained. Wherefore we do give ourselves with reverence and humility to these endeavors, offering up our works and our persons in the Name of Him, without whom nothing is strong, nothing is holy. Amen."

Note.—The writer wishes to acknowledge his indebtedness to Joseph Bonnet, upon whose *Historical Organ Recitals* (published by G. Schirmer) he has freely drawn for certain biographical and historical data.—S. B.

The Old Testament Idea of God and Its Modern Relevance

J. PHILIP HYATT

BIBLICAL religion and theology are receiving at the present time more cordial attention and interest than they enjoyed a decade or two ago. Not only is it true that leading theological thinkers, such as Karl Barth in Europe and Reinhold Niebuhr in America, frequently assert the modern validity of biblical ideas, but many Christians of various schools of thought are not as scornful of the Bible as they were in the optimistic days before the rise of Hitler and other events upset our modern hopefulness regarding God and man. Many have come to see that biblical writers are more profound than they formerly suspected, and so have returned to the Bible with genuine enthusiasm or with a sense of disillusionment over humanism or an inadequate theism.

When we turn to the Bible today we may do so with greater prospect of a true historical understanding of it than ever before. I believe it is no exaggeration to say that we are today in a position to translate the Bible more accurately and to understand it more profoundly than at any time in history. This is due to the new knowledge of the Ancient Near East, which has come to us through the work of many archaeologists, philologists and other scholars. The span of known history has been extended literally by millennia in the last century. We can now trace out the sources of many Old Testament ideas, institutions and customs which were formerly obscure, and can compare Hebrew-Jewish ideas with those of other ancient peoples.

There are undoubtedly many readers who will object to the singular word "idea" in the title of this paper. They will say that the Old Testament presents many *ideas* of God, and that all of them cannot possibly be valid, since some of them are mutually contradictory, and they cannot all be relevant to our present situation. Such an objection would be well founded in at least two respects.

The Old Testament does, in the first place, present various ideas of God from the various levels of ancient Hebrew society. There were certain ideas of deity entertained by the masses in the popular religion, which are reflected in some passages of the Old Testament, in archaeo-

logical discoveries, and in modern "primitive survivals." There were other ideas (sometimes different, sometimes simply more advanced) held by the prophets, and still others maintained in ecclesiastical and legalistic circles. It is possible to make too much of the Prophet-*versus*-Priest controversy in the Old Testament, but it did exist. The prophet certainly considered some of his ideas of God as antithetic to those of the priest; if the latter did not think of his conceptions as contrary to those of the prophet, they were at least supplementary. The Priest-*versus*-Prophet conflict in pre-exilic times is well symbolized by Amos's expulsion from Bethel by Amaziah; the resolution of the conflict may be seen in the Deuteronomic reforms and even better in the preaching of Haggai and Zechariah, urging the rebuilding of the temple after the exile.

In the second place, the objection would be well founded in view of the development of ideas of God which can be traced in the Old Testament. This development does not, to be sure, follow the lines of unilinear evolution, and it does not correspond as closely to a neat Hegelian scheme as some German scholars once depicted it. But there is development in Old Testament religion—for example, from henotheism or monolatry to monotheism (for recent attempts to revive the theory of Mosaic monotheism have not really been successful), from nationalism to universalism (and back to nationalism), and from crude to refined anthropomorphism.

Nevertheless, even after these objections are stated and admitted, I believe that one is justified in writing of an Old Testament *idea* of God in the sense that certain ways of thinking about God are characteristic of Old Testament thought, especially when seen at its best; that the Hebrew conception of deity differed in important aspects from the conceptions held by surrounding peoples; and that certain Old Testament ideas of God may be considered as "normative" for Jewish and Christian thought as opposed to lower or even heretical views of God expressed in the Old Testament itself. For the Old Testament canon does contain its "heretics"—for example, the Book of Ecclesiastes in its original form. Many of our present difficulties in dealing with Old Testament religion are due to the general lack of interest on the part of the ancient Hebrews in systematic and consistent thought, and also in what we call orthodoxy. They were always more interested in right conduct than in right belief, in "orthopraxy" rather than orthodoxy.

I wish to approach the subject of this paper from the viewpoint just expressed in the foregoing paragraph. Perhaps it should be said at the outset that my viewpoint is not that of a theologian, but that of a student of the Old Testament and the Ancient Orient in general, who is also deeply interested in modern religion.

If we begin at the most obvious point, we must say that the God of the Old Testament is an anthropomorphic deity. This is the side of Old Testament theology which is most frequently offensive to the modern mind, and has been offensive to the philosophers of many ages; the philosophers have frequently accused the Hebrew of making God in his own image. Yet, when seen in its proper perspective, its anthropomorphism is the source of much of the strength and glory of Old Testament religion.

The Hebrew thought of his God, Yahweh, as a person. This meant that he could not think of Yahweh as an astral deity, a deification of one or more of the heavenly bodies, as the Sumerians and Babylonians thought of some of their gods and goddesses. Yahweh was, furthermore, not a deification of an animal, a theriomorphic deity, as was the case with some Egyptian and Canaanite gods. Nor was He a philosophical abstraction like the god of Greek philosophy.

Although Yahweh was considered to be a person, He was not thought of as having family or kindred, as were most of the other anthropomorphic gods of antiquity, and this was very important. The type of deity who had a family and the necessarily attendant family quarrels can be seen in Greek mythology and in the Phoenician mythology revealed by the recently discovered tablets of Ras Shamra, Syria. There one may see a great array of gods, related in various ways, who engage in various conflicts and often descend to very low levels of conduct. The "sons of God" which occur occasionally in the Old Testament must be considered as unassimilated remnants of such pagan mythology or simply as attendants of the One God.

The Hebrew idea of Yahweh, as without family and kindred, gave to Old Testament religion a severity and the possibility of a spirituality which is not to be found in other ancient religions. Popular religion in Palestine turned to the worship of various mother-goddesses, such as Ashtart and Anat, as is shown by the numerous figurines of these goddesses which appear in almost every Palestinian excavation. At Elephantine in Egypt, as we know from the Aramaic papyri discovered there, Jews in the

fifth century B. C. combined the worship of the goddess Anat with that of Yahweh, so that the name Anat-Yahu appears in their pantheon. Such practices as these, however, were doubtless frowned upon by the religious leaders who must have thought of them as pagan.

The anthropomorphisms of the Old Testament idea of God have given to it an element of "urgency" or "energy," as Rudolf Otto pointed out in *The Idea of the Holy* (pp. 23f). They made possible the worship of a "living God." If we are inclined today to be revolted by the cruder anthropomorphisms of the Hebrew religion—for example, by the thought of a God who takes a walk in the Garden of Eden in the cool of the day—we should remember that the Hebrews themselves outgrew these cruder ideas, and they are not typical of the later and the best ideas to be found in the Old Testament. We should not forget, also, that only an anthropomorphic deity could eventually be thought of as a *loving Father*, as He is in the teaching of Jesus.

A second feature of the Old Testament idea of God which is fairly obvious is that it conceived of Yahweh as an ethical deity. This is quite clear in the work of the classical prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries B. C. They thought of Yahweh as a God who *is* just and righteous and who *demand*s justice and righteousness of those who would worship Him.

It is not so clear that this was the viewpoint of those who lived before the time of Amos. Yet it is entirely probable that there was an ethical emphasis in the work of Moses, and that it was he who originated this characteristically Hebrew mode of thinking about God. It cannot be proved, but it is possible (as some critical scholars believe) that Moses was the author of the familiar Ten Commandments, in a shorter form than we now have them and with, of course, a much more limited application than we give to them today. The classical prophets did not think of themselves as originators of a new movement, but as reformers who were summoning the people to a purer type of Yahwism such as they believed existed in Moses' time. It is significant also that Hebrew-Jewish tradition always attributes *law* to Moses, and this tradition doubtless has a kernel of truth in it.

This ethical element is retained in the work of the post-exilic leaders of Jewish life who were usually priests and legalists. They thought of themselves as supplementing, not supplanting, the work of Amos, Hosea

and the other great prophets. The Book of Leviticus, a priestly book, contains much dreary ceremonialism, but it also contains the words, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" (19: 18). The true genius of Judaism, even of Pharisaism when rightly understood, is shown in its ability to combine both the ethical and the ritualistic in one religion.

The emphasis upon Yahweh as a moral God making moral requirements resulted in the view of Him as a judge over society and the individual. With this view it was impossible to consider Him as the patron of the *status quo*. This is an element in Old Testament theology as valid today as in the eighth century B. C. And it is important to notice that the prophets did not use "practical" arguments for the establishment of justice, such as that society itself would ultimately benefit more from justice than from injustice. Nor did they say that justice was of the true "nature of things." What they did say was that a just and righteous God requires justice and righteousness as a part of the true worship of Him.

In the third place, the God of the Old Testament is a universal deity. This is true of the best of Old Testament religion. There is, to be sure, plenty of nationalism in this book, and many of its parts present a narrow view of Yahweh as the deity of only the Hebrew or Jewish people. This can be sympathetically understood in the light of their history and their frequent sufferings at the hands of foreigners. But the heights of real universalism are reached in books such as The Second Isaiah, Ruth and Jonah. The Second Isaiah thought of Yahweh as the One Eternal Creator of the world and mankind who was—or ultimately should be—the God of all men, Gentile as well as Jew.

This is an extremely important phase of Old Testament religion which should be deeply pondered today. The Hebrews of ancient times were hardly as nationalistic in their thinking as most people of Europe and America today, and the deity whom we worship is often in actuality a national deity whom we invoke for national victory and prosperity. The modern ecumenical movement has made some progress, but it would make vastly greater progress if we could divest ourselves of our national idols and national deities, and come to think of the One God as a truly universal, ecumenical deity. In this respect an advance in theology would facilitate advance in world unity.

Another feature of the Old Testament idea of God which deserves attention is the way in which it was able to combine characteristics of

divinity which are not always combined, but which must be combined in any adequate religion. For example, it combined in a remarkable way the idea of a God of nature with the idea of an intimate personal deity; in theological language, the Old Testament God is both transcendent and immanent.

This can be observed in many parts of the Old Testament. In the polytheistic patriarchal age, before the introduction of Yahwism, Abraham is represented as worshipping a very intimate god, known perhaps as "The Shield of Abraham" (Genesis 15: 1), with whom he has a personal covenant, but he also worshiped *El Elyon*, "God Most High," doubtless a Canaanite deity, who is described as "creator of heavens and earth" (Genesis 14: 22). In the time of Moses, Yahweh was a nature-god, associated especially with the violent forces of nature (such as storms and earthquakes), but also one who entered into a very close covenant relationship with Israel. It is possible that the name "Yahweh" meant originally "He causes to be (what comes into existence)," as W. F. Albright maintains.¹ In other words, Yahweh may have been originally a creator-deity.

At the other end of the development of Old Testament thought, The Second Isaiah conceived of Yahweh as the Sole God, the Eternal Creator, of whom he could yet say:

"Like a shepherd he will feed his flock,
In his arms he will gather them;
The lambs in his bosom he will take,
And gently lead those with young" (40: 11).

Leon Roth has said that the Kant of the *Critique of Practical Reason* was "only a Moses speaking German." Kant's appeal to "the moral law within" and "the starry heavens without" recalls the bringing together in Psalm XIX of the heavens which "declare the glory of God" and the *Torah* (Law) which "restoreth the soul."² In fine, the God of the Old Testament is usually both "a God at hand" and "a God afar off" (Jeremiah 23: 23).

Another remarkable combination made by the Old Testament is that of the power of God with the love and mercy of God. It is not easy to combine both of these in one's thought. In polytheistic religions the god of power and the god (or goddess) of love are usually different deities.

¹ *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, p. 198.

² *The Legacy of Israel*, p. 461.

The central problem for the Hebrew monotheist was to affirm, in the face of the evil and suffering which exist in the world (and which he was too realistic to deny), that Yahweh was both powerful and merciful. There are "heretical" books in the Old Testament which deny this. Certainly the original Ecclesiastes denied it, for his theology was very close to deism, and I believe that it is denied also in Job, where the power of God is retained at the expense of His love. But in the main stream of thought in the Old Testament, Yahweh is considered to be both powerful and merciful. This is not presented as the result of speculation, but as the result of experience or revelation.

The most resolute attempt made by any Hebrew thinker to make both of these affirmations and yet to reconcile them with the existence of innocent suffering is that of Second Isaiah. In his noble idea of suffering as vicarious and redemptive, as presented in the famous Suffering Servant poems, the high-water mark of Old Testament thought regarding deity is reached. Unfortunately, his idea had apparently little or no influence on subsequent Old Testament thought, but found expression and a new application in the New Testament, as is well known.

Another important feature of the Old Testament idea of God is that Yahweh came to be considered as the Planner and Controller of History. It is characteristic of Old Testament thinking that the concept of time is nearly always present in it; Hebrew thought is seldom truly transcendental. Thus, it was necessary that Yahweh be thought of as manifesting Himself in the time-process. In the work of the J and E writers, Yahweh is pictured as controlling Hebrew history, and Hosea makes large use of this conception. Other prophets expanded this thought to include Yahweh's control over the career of other nations. To Isaiah the Assyrian king was the rod of Yahweh's anger (10: 5); to Jeremiah Nebuchadrezzar was Yahweh's servant (27: 6); and The Second Isaiah could speak of Cyrus as the agent commissioned by Yahweh to perform a task for Him (44: 28; 45: 1). The most fully developed "philosophy of history" is to be found in the Book of Daniel, where history is symbolically depicted as a series of progressively deteriorating ages, culminating in the Kingdom of God. In the apocalyptic literature in general, God is thought of as planning and controlling history, and as revealing His plan to chosen seers.

The Hebrew was always more interested in the God Who Does than the God Who Is. His God was, therefore, one whose actions could be

seen in the historical process and who could be trusted ultimately to work out His purposes in time. He believed that history does have a culmination; hence, for him the Golden Age was thought of as lying in the future, not in some distant past.

We may think today that the Hebrew idea of the manner in which God controls history was too narrow and restricted. As for the future, most of us have little interest or confidence in detailed forecasts of the future culmination. Yet we should share the Hebrew's fundamental faith that God does control the destiny of man in history, and that His interest extends to the end as well as to the beginning of the time-process.

Finally, one must say that the God of the Old Testament is nearly always a *severe* God. This is another feature of the Old Testament which, like anthropomorphism, is often offensive to the modern man. It is, however, one which he should understand better and whose significance he should consider.

Several features of Old Testament religion contributed to this element in its idea of God: the fact that Yahwism had its origin in the desert, where life itself is difficult and severe; the fact that Yahweh was thought of as without family or kindred; and the prohibition against the use of images. The crudest example of the severity of the Old Testament God is that incident narrated in Exodus 4: 24-26, in which Yahweh, apparently unprovoked, sought to slay Moses and was appeased only by an act of circumcision. But even in later times there was an element of severity in Hebrew and Jewish thought of deity. Even Hosea, the prophet who emphasizes most Yahweh's love and mercy, could say that the following were words of his God:

"For I will be as a lion unto Ephraim,
And as a young lion unto the house of Judah;
I, even I, will rend and go away,
I will carry off, with none to deliver" (5: 14).

In the earlier periods of Israelite history the severity of Yahweh is often arbitrarily manifested. In later periods it is directed toward the enemies of the nation or the unrighteous. There is an element of severity in Jesus' teaching about God, even though he emphasized God's love and Fatherhood. He is reported to have said: "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell" (Matthew 10: 28).

The severity of Yahweh was sometimes arbitrary and irrational, but when it became rational and ethical, it conveyed to man a very significant truth. That which the Hebrew wished to say in dwelling upon the anger and severity of Yahweh is that He is a God who, although loving and merciful toward the obedient, is too righteous to permit evil to go forever unpunished. To us today, as to the Hebrew in the past, this may be a source both of dread and of trust—of dread lest we align ourselves with the forces of evil; of trust that God's benign purposes for mankind cannot ultimately be thwarted.

The Old Testament idea of God does have relevance and value for religious life today. One should not try to defend the acceptance of the Old Testament as a whole, nor a purely literal interpretation of it. Nor should it be denied that much advance has been made in thought of God since this book was written. On the Christian side, advance is to be found in the New Testament and in Christian theologians and philosophers; on the Jewish side, advance is to be found in rabbinic literature and Jewish philosophers. But the fundamental insights of the Old Testament, such as those which have been suggested above, are basic for our religious life and thought.

Social Reconstruction in Great Britain

W. HAMILTON FYFE

SOME day this war will end and, the nightmare over, we shall open our eyes to a scene of widespread destruction. Our task will then be reconstruction. For that many plans are already being devised by experts—and by others. What is the general aim of all these plans? Our King gave a clear answer to that question, when he envisaged the coming of “ordered liberty and social justice”; others with the same meaning speak of “world order and economic prosperity”; clearest of all is the phrase in the Atlantic Charter, a phrase that seems to bear the signature of President Roosevelt’s strong and simple style—“freedom from fear and freedom from want”—or, to put the same thing in a single word, “security.” That is the desire of every human being.

The last twenty-five years have miserably failed to satisfy that desire, chiefly because it was not fully understood that freedom from fear and freedom from want are interdependent. We cannot have one without the other. The failure to achieve social and economic security was a chief cause of the failure of the League of Nations to achieve “collective security,” and that failure in turn defeated all hopes of establishing social security in this and other countries. We have to plan, not, as after the last war, partly for the one freedom and partly for the other. That insures failure. We have to plan for both at once, and, therefore, any forecast of social reconstruction in Great Britain must rest upon the assumption that some stable form of international organization will—to quote again the Atlantic Charter—“afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries.” In the development of government across frontiers we shall start not from the thoughts and methods of the pre-war years, but with the experience which war has forced upon us.

Equally in looking forward to the task of social reconstruction we must make our viewpoint not 1939 but 194?; I am not pessimist enough to suggest 195?. Between those viewpoints there has already yawned a great gulf of difference, and the question is where do we go from *here*, not from there?

In those bad days the most glaring blot upon British civilization was unemployment. War has removed it. In that fact there would indeed be tragic irony, but for the idea which lies under the fact, the idea, clearly and firmly avowed in time of war, that for the good of the whole each man and woman must be used in the work for which each is best fitted. Is that not equally true in time of peace? We have rationed both food and clothing, thus giving effect to the idea that in time of war everybody, irrespective of income, should have a minimum of the basic needs of life. And why not in peacetime? We have established national control of agriculture, so as to educate and discipline and in some cases to dispossess farmers who are not making the best use of their land. Because in time of war the full and proper use of agricultural land is a national necessity. It is equally necessary in time of peace.

To give children the chance of escaping the worst extremes of bombing the Government has evacuated them to the country without expense to their parents, which suggests that they might in peacetime be evacuated for part of the year from city to countryside without expense to their parents. Those who could afford the luxury of Boarding Schools have always followed that policy for their children. In the control which war has inevitably fastened upon Industry, the Government allots priority to the processes which satisfy the most urgent national needs; the urgency of the need determines the degree of priority. When peace comes, will the channels of Industry be decided solely by possibilities of profit or will the claims of national need be kept in consideration? Lastly, every man and woman in the country today is legally at the disposal of the Government; because it is clear to all that in time of war the good of all is the good of each. Can anyone deny the truth of that in time of peace?

From all experience, even from the experience of uttermost disaster, there are lessons to be learned by those who survive. The experience of war has a peculiarly powerful effect in opening men's eyes both to the merits and to the defects of the society for the preservation of which they are fighting. Indeed, in proportion as they realize—almost with surprise—how precious is their national society, they feel bound to confess and to remedy its defects. They are ready to die for it as it is, and to make it better if their lives are spared. That is how most people feel both in Great Britain and in the United States. And most of them, however much they may wrangle about the means, are in large measure agreed

about the end to be aimed at, which is—in a wide, ambiguous phrase—a fair deal for all alike. They most of them also agree that the cards must be dealt under rules that are recognizably democratic.

And there, it may be, is the rub. Democracy is of many kinds. Its political form is widely different in Great Britain, in America, in Switzerland, in Sweden. Democracy is a way of life, lived in a certain spirit. And of that spirit the chief ingredients are toleration and a sense of justice. Among people who live their lives in that spirit liberty is of high price, and government exists not to subordinate the citizen to the state but to secure to each citizen an equal share of the maximum degree of liberty.

It is on the limits of liberty that disagreement arises. In Great Britain, while industry and commerce were steadily expanding, and in America while the frontier was still being shifted westward by the pioneers, liberty was limited only by the functions of the police. It seemed natural and right that within the limits of the law, everyone should be free to do what he pleased, and that each nation should enjoy the same freedom within the limits of international law, though what these were few people knew or cared. Today the interdependence of nations all the world over and the interdependence of the people living in each nation are facts that have become familiar in economic organization but are not yet fully faced in the sphere of national and international politics. There lies, perhaps, the most difficult problem of reconstruction. On its solution depends the achievement of a deal that is both fair and democratic.

It is obvious that the achievement of liberty depends upon the restriction of liberty. A familiar example of that is traffic control. Without control of traffic, no automobile could hope to travel half a mile in safety—certainly not on certain roads that I remember in the State of New York! It is the restrictions which assure the maximum liberty of movement. That is what they are for. If they exceed that purpose, they are unjustifiable in a democratic state. The problem confronting democracies is there epitomized. What degree of control is necessary to assure a fair deal to each man, woman and child in the nation? We also ask: What are the essentials of a fair deal? As it seems to me, the war has answered that question, since it has proved that over a wide area private and public interest coincide. The good of all is the good of each and the good of each is the good of all. That sounds like the maxim of a schoolroom copy-

book. In fact, it is the principle on which we base our war economy. It is the sole justification of the strict control in which our wartime years are lived. And it will be the sole justification of all government control imposed in peacetime. In war the good of each and of all is the achievement of victory. In peacetime it is the achievement of human health and happiness to the maximum possible degree, and before that achievement can even loom on hope's horizon, there must be secured to each citizen a minimum of the basic necessities of fully human life. That means a necessary minimum of food, clothing, housing—and what is perhaps less obvious in wartime—the education proper to the mental capacity of each and the opportunity for each to use his or her faculties to good purpose.

If on the outbreak of peace the controls of wartime were suddenly removed, there would be no hope of that achievement. Some must go, some must remain, some must be modified. For international security there must be international control to cope with the chaos of a battered world. For social security there must be such control as is necessary to secure this fair deal for each in the interests of all, and beyond that point a free field for enterprise, originality and ambition.

To ascertain that point and to draw the line is a task for experts. But there is room for the rest of us. Indeed the experts cannot succeed without our co-operation. And our job is to pocket our ideological prejudices, to convert our "isms" into "wasms," to discuss amongst ourselves each proposal on its merits and to judge each by reference to the purpose of democratic government, which is the exercise of sufficient control to secure to each citizen the maximum possible degree of liberty. In discussion and judgment our difficulty will be to think democratically and to keep the tolerant temper of the democratic spirit. We may have to lose privileges, to make sacrifice of property, to relinquish elements of power. We may seem to be paying more than our fair share of the price of genuine democracy. The unity, and effort and sacrifice with which we have met the needs of war will easily change into disillusion, skepticism and the narrow viewpoint of class interest. When war ends, the whole nation will give a great sigh of relief and relaxation, and with that sense of relaxation cracks in the surface of national unity will begin to show. Unless there are statesmen ready to avert the earthquake by leaping, like Quintus Curtius, into the yawning gulf, we shall quickly develop internal antagonism. Some will stand for cherished privilege, some for its mere

destruction; some will advocate state control for its own sake, some will shout "hands off industry," some will cling to the principles of democracy. The danger that threatens the future is national disunity, a danger as formidable as the onslaught of an enemy and even harder to avert.

That is where we come in, we who are not experts but "just folks." We are the vast majority and therefore, if democracy survives, our votes and voices will be the determining factor. For us the problem is both intellectual and moral. We must improve our minds so that we may look to the future with disinterested judgment of the past. We must improve our obedience to the moral imperative, which (oh! so inconveniently!) demands disinterested action. And indeed for the likes of us the moral problem is the more important and the more likely to be obscured by the misty distortion of prejudice and self-interest. Have we the integrity of character necessary for its solution?

President Masaryk, the one great democratic leader of the last generation, said that democracy "depends on whether people are decent and educated." And he held also that the basic principle of democracy was the Christian commandment to love one's neighbor as oneself. Here is the challenge to us definitely stated. It is a challenge we cannot escape. We are paying for war through the nose; we can secure peace only through the activity of heart and head—by being decent as well as educated. Is it *true* that we are all members one of another? Is it *true* that, if one member suffers, the other members suffer with it? Is that true of nations? Is it true of men and women in different economic "classes"? If it *is* true, then we cannot be content merely to assent to the statement when we hear it read, perhaps, in church. That would be to repeat the complacent self-deception which has landed us in disaster. If it is true, we must *act* accordingly. That is going to make a big demand on all of us. We shan't like it; we shall want to shirk it; but unless we face it and meet it, the hope of reconstruction is vain.

Isn't that true both of Great Britain *and* of the United States? We can neither of us attain the fulfillment of our aims, unless our close partnership outlasts the war. That is certain. It is equally certain that we shall fail to realize our hopes, unless Americans and Britons act nationally and internationally "in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace and in righteousness of life." To which the cynic and the optimist will reply, with an infinite difference of meaning—"What a hope!"

The Christian Ashram Fellowship

JESSE M. BADER

WHAT is an Ashram? This is a new and a strange word to many. It is a word from the land of India. Its derivation is variously given. Some scholars say it is from *a*—from, and *shram*—hard work: a cessation from hard work. Others say the *a* is intensive, and that the word means an intensification of hard work.

The fact is that both kinds of expression of the Ashram spirit can be found. The Christian Ashram makes use of both meanings. Some turn aside from life and toil and become members of an Ashram to give themselves to a period of meditation and a realization of God. It is a cessation of hard work. Then there are others who go into an Ashram for a mental and spiritual discipline in order to give themselves more completely to the service of the outside world. Far from being a cessation of hard work, it is an intensification of it, for the hard work is both upon oneself in discipline and upon others in service, often of the most menial kind.

The Indian term is *Asrama*. The *Asrama* is a very old institution running through the ages of Indian history. There is no orthodox type of Ashram either in Hinduism or in the Christian expression of it.

Rabindranath Tagore's Ashram revolves around culture, poetry and art, with an agricultural appendage. Great stress is laid on self-control, self-sacrifice and private meditation. The group decides upon its own disciplines.

Mahatma Gandhi's Ashram at Sabarmati revolves around the idea of national service, largely through indigenous cottage industries. It is religion trying to rehabilitate the country. One day a week is given to complete silence. The members arise at 4 A. M. for prayers. Other times of the day are also kept for prayer. In prison Gandhi continued these practices, which indicates how deeply they are a part of his life.

C. F. Andrews said that every great moral and spiritual leader in India sooner or later founds an Ashram for the sake of giving a concrete expression to his own creative ideas.

There are now about twenty-four Ashrams in India, most of which have come into being in recent years. They are of different kinds—eco-

nomic, political, industrial and religious. Some of these are held continuously, and others for a certain period annually.

The origin of the Ashram was a forest school where a *guru* or teacher, with his *chelas* or disciples, would go aside together in a wooded place and join together in a spiritual quest for God, and a release through philosophical thought and spiritual exercise. While the Ashram began in the forest, many were and are held in the cities. But the general meaning of *Asrama* is "life in a forest."

The Christian Ashram movement was begun in India about 1930. The first one was held at Sat Tal on an estate of four hundred acres with a lake of its own, its eighteen cottages and the central large house in which the Ashram is held. The altitude is five thousand feet which takes the group out of the intense summer heat.

Christian missionaries in India have taken the framework of the Hindu Ashram and put into it a Christian content. It seemed quite natural for the Christians to adopt the Ashram form of expression and make it their own, for the Ashram had little, or no, connection with idolatry. It fitted in with the Christian idea of simplicity and corporate spiritual quest. E. Stanley Jones, well-known missionary of India, says: "It seemed to be the very thing the Christians were looking for, for in this indigenous mold the Indian Christian would be at home; he would be on his own ground; could think his own thoughts and be creative. . . . It was this quest for the Kingdom-of-God order that drove some of us to adopt the Ashram as a possible mold in which this order might be expressed. This quest for the Kingdom-of-God order was not primary in the beginnings of the establishment of our Ashrams. That came out as we went along."

The second Indian Ashram to be organized was at Lucknow which is not now in operation. At this Ashram an attempt was made to find the economic basis for the Kingdom of God. Each Ashram member was asked to make out his budget of minimum need. Food and lodging would be the same but other needs would differ. The basis of judging what that need was is found in the statement, "We have a right to use as much of the material as will make us more fit for the purposes of the Kingdom of God." Each budget of need was submitted to the group and reviewed item by item. The budget amounts were arrived at corporately.

In the Indian Christian Ashrams, one day each week is set aside for

complete silence. This custom was copied from Gandhi's Ashram. The Indian Christians and missionaries like it. They say that after talking to each other for six days it is an immense relief to have a day to oneself when no one raises an issue or presents a question. Most of them go out to the forest that day with a book, and pray in order to consolidate their spiritual gains.

Another day of the week is given in the Indian Ashrams to the servants for a holiday, and the Ashram group volunteers to take their places. This means cooking, waiting tables, cleaning rooms, policing the grounds, etc., etc. Such a fellowship across chasms of class, race, caste and political lines, breaks down barriers and builds bridges.

There is a daily work period in an Indian Christian Ashram. To work with one's hands in India is not considered respectable—no gentleman does it. That is why this is done in the Ashram. It helps to break down another barrier, and puts those who work, into the new stream of thought in India in which work is not only respectable but highly patriotic. It is a fine discipline to have bishops, government officials, Brahmans and others, working side by side.

The Ashram attempts to be in fact a Family of God, "a demonstration in miniature of the meaning of the Kingdom of God." It is a Christian fellowship in the deepest sense. This fellowship is not out of a group of likeminded people. The radical and the conservative are brought together. The non-Christian is included, and may enter into the fellowship and worship as far as he feels he can do so.

This word "fellowship" is a demanding and disturbing word. We think we have satisfied it, and then it begins to ask questions about the compartmentalisms of life not yet touched or possessed by it. This New Testament word has dropped out of so much of the life of Christians. It needs to come alive again and to find expression.

As to a daily program, the rising bell rings at five-thirty. The Ashram group goes out to the prayer knoll for silent, corporate worship. An entire hour is spent in this silent fellowship. Usually a hymn begins and closes the hour. The morning meal is eaten in Indian style, sitting cross-legged on the floor. The work period follows the breakfast. After this, two hours are given over to corporate thinking on some particular subject. Following the noon meal, the afternoon is free for recreation, rest and fellowship. In the evening by the lakeside, there is a vesper service before a cross, planted in a clearing on the opposite mountainside.

On Sunday mornings during the Ashram, there is a Communion Service conducted at one time by an Anglican and at another, by a Free Churchman. In such a Communion Service there are many shades of theological belief and church polity—all the way from the High Churchman to the Quaker, including all types between. At the close of the Communion, there is "a Meeting of the Open Heart," in which "we really let each other into the inner secrets of our lives." "This whole Sat Tal is a vast graveyard," said a young man as he was about to leave the Ashram. "It is full of the graves of our dead selves. I am leaving a grave behind me and going back a new man." Another put it like this, "I came here a flickering torch and I am going away a flaming torch."

ASHRAMS IN AMERICA

From the very beginning, the Ashram in America has been sponsored by the Department of Evangelism of the Federal Council of Churches. The Council has now in its constituent membership, twenty-four denominations and twenty-six million members. Therefore, the Ashram Movement here in America is directed by the Church, and is responsible to the Church, and is not something carried on apart from the Church and responsible to no one but to itself.

The idea, of course, came from the Ashram Movement in India. When the idea was first proposed for the holding of an Ashram in America, there were those in the Department who felt that there was a decided place for such a movement among us provided it could be modified and adapted to our American life and needs. At first some objected to the term "Ashram" on the grounds that the word was new—that it was not indigenous—and that no one would understand what was meant when the word was used. Finally it was decided that the Department use the term, "The American Christian Ashram."

It was felt by the Department of Evangelism that an Ashram should not be held until E. Stanley Jones could be present to help by his guidance and messages. Since he had been so much a part of the Indian Christian Ashram Movement, everyone was of the opinion that his experience would mean much in the launching of an Ashram here. When it was decided that he should be invited to participate in the 1940 Christian Missions which were to begin in Kansas City in September, an invitation was sent to Doctor Jones to return in late July in time for the first

Ashram at Saugatuck, Michigan. He accepted and arrived all the way from India one minute ahead of time.

An Ashram Committee was appointed by the Department of Evangelism with Bishop John S. Stamm, of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as the Chairman, and the writer as the National Director. And so it followed that in the summer of 1940, the first Ashram was held in two sections and in two parts of the nation. One was conducted at Westminster Lodge, Saugatuck, Michigan, July 27 through August 10, with an attendance for the two weeks of 215. Those attending came from twenty-eight states and five Canadian Provinces. The second one was held at Blue Ridge, North Carolina, August 10-24, with an attendance of 301, representing twenty-one states.

Both Saugatuck and Blue Ridge are almost ideal places for the holding of an Ashram. Saugatuck, Michigan, is situated one hundred miles north of Chicago on the eastern shore of Lake Michigan. Westminster Lodge is the name of the camp. This camp is owned and directed by the Presbyterian Church (U. S. A.) and consists of 143 acres of beautiful, heavily wooded dune country. No one who has ever been to this wooded spot can forget the cool weather, the white clean sand along the beach, the beautiful sunsets and the views across the lake from the cottages nestling among the trees along the lake front.

Blue Ridge is located on the edge of Smoky Mountain Park in the midst of the rugged mountains of North Carolina. It is fifteen miles from Asheville. These mountains, although located in the South, offer one of the coolest summer climates to be found in America. Mean temperature for the three summer months is just above 62 degrees. The Blue Ridge elevation is 2,700 feet.

During the summer of 1941, the Ashram was held in three places. One section was held at Occidental College, Los Angeles, California, on July 18 to July 30; the second section, at Blue Ridge, North Carolina, August 1-15; and the third section, at Saugatuck, Michigan, August 15-29.

Arrangements have been made to hold the 1942 Ashram in four places as follows:

Occidental College, Los Angeles, California . . .	July 4-18
Blue Ridge, North Carolina	July 18-August 1
Winnepesaukee, New Hampshire	August 1-15
Lake Geneva, Wisconsin	August 16-30

It can be seen from the above that the Ashram Movement has been growing. One new place has been added each year in order to serve an additional section of the nation.

The Ashram membership is international. At Saugatuck in 1940, there were fourteen representatives present from Canada. Missionaries and Nationals from many lands are to be found in the group. The membership is also interracial. Everyone is entertained in the Ashram on the same basis. There can be no race prejudice or discrimination where a group is attempting to become a miniature of the Kingdom of God on earth. A young Chinese student, having recently arrived in America, was being shown the grounds of Saugatuck on the first day of his arrival at the Ashram. The dining hall was pointed out with the words, "And here is where we eat." "But where do I eat?" was his reply. In the fellowship of the Ashram family he found there was no discrimination.

One of the first things attempted in the beginning hours of an Ashram is to break down barriers. These barriers exist between God and the individual, and between one individual and another. As long as these barriers exist there can be no real experience of fellowship. With these barriers down, the group attempts to become an organism of the Holy Spirit.

The first barrier that needs to be pulled down is the one between God and the individual, for one can never have a proper attitude toward others until his relationships with God are straightened out. So on the very first day the members are asked to tell why they have come and what they most want from the Ashram. There is an immediate response to this. Some make their statements about themselves and their needs quite briefly, while others require a longer time. These statements are made before the group. Ofttimes one meeting does not afford enough time for all to speak, who wish to do so, hence a second and sometimes a third meeting is necessary.

Second, the barrier between races must come down. In the Saugatuck Ashram last summer, ten different races were represented. One of the mottoes on the wall of the meeting room reads, "Leave behind all race and class distinction ye that enter here." The Kingdom of God is race-and-class blind, so the Ashram must be also.

Third, the barrier of class is pulled down. In any American group, there exists more class snobbery than we like to admit. It is there—

great chunks of it sometimes. To help eradicate it, all titles at the Ashram are dropped, such as Bishop, Doctor, Reverend, etc. Each person is called by his first name.

The work period of one hour daily also helps to obliterate class lines. The work is voluntary and almost everyone participates. The men sweep, paint, mow lawns, wash windows, carry trays, mend broken furniture, cut wood and trim trees. The women sew for relief organizations, knit, make beds, mend linen, sweep floors and help in the kitchen. It does something to an individual to work by the side of a bishop, doctor, lawyer or teacher, as well as a farmer, mechanic or the factory girl. Nor does one notice the color of his neighbor's skin while working with him.

Before going into the work period, the work song is sung together by the group to the tune, "The Church's One Foundation"—

"O, Thou who long did'st labor,
With hammer, saw and plane,
Help us this day to serve Thee,
With hands and heart and brain.
In toil we fain would find Thee
O Workman, strong and fair,
And thus become the comrades
Of workers everywhere."

Fourth, the barrier is broken down between those who lead and those who are led by having long periods of silence in which God speaks to both the leaders and led. Also, co-operative thinking is engaged in, in which the group reaches united conclusions. It is not necessary in an Ashram to have one type of mind in order to have a fellowship. One does not have to agree with the intellectual point of view of another in order to have fellowship with him. The various members of the group can state their points of view and then hold together in spite of differences. In this connection, another motto on the wall of the Ashram meeting room is:

"Here we enter a fellowship;
Sometimes we will agree to differ;
Always we will resolve to love,
And unite to serve."

"What do you do in the Ashram?" I frequently am asked. "Will you not describe a day's program?" Perhaps this is a good place to relate just what is done by the Ashram group on any one day. The rising bell sounds at 6:15 and the group assembles at 6:30 for an hour of corporate silence and worship. One verse of a hymn is sung, followed

by forty-five minutes of silence. At the conclusion of the silence, each one who will, is asked to share what he has found with the group. Following an audible prayer, the leader with uplifted hand, says, "The Lord is risen." The group responds saying together, "The Lord is risen indeed." Breakfast at 7:30. The grace at meals is usually sung. The song most often used is sung to the tune of "Maryland, My Maryland"—

"We thank Thee, Lord, for daily bread
And all Thy blessings 'round us spread;
We bless Thee for Thy love and care,
For guidance in the hour of prayer;
For Ashram comrades, eager, true,
For love's unfinished work to do.
In all we think and do and say,
Thy Kingdom come in us today."

After breakfast, time is allowed in the schedule for the making of beds and the cleaning of the rooms. This work is usually done by the regularly employed staff but the Ashram volunteers to relieve them of this much of their work. Most members of the staffs where the Ashrams are held are college boys and girls who are working their way through school.

At 8:30 in the morning is the time for the first lecture. Last summer the messages of this hour were on the theme, "What is Christianity?" This theme was discussed by such eminent men as Harris Franklin Rall, of Garrett Biblical Institute of Chicago; Adolph Keller, of Geneva, Switzerland; and George Richards, of Lancaster, Pennsylvania.

The work period is from 9:30 to 10:30. The time from 11:00 to 12:00 is given over to a message from E. Stanley Jones. During the summer of 1940 he discussed with the group the manuscript, chapter by chapter, of his new book, *Is the Kingdom of God Realism*. In the 1941 Ashram he presented the manuscript of another book he was writing on *Living Abundantly*. He gratefully acknowledges his indebtedness to the group for many fine suggestions, a number of which are included in these two books.

Following the noon meal at 12:30, there is free time for recreation of all kinds with special leaders and committees in charge.

From 4:00 to 5:30 the Seminars are in session. Three to five are held simultaneously. At the end of the first week, the group registers again for the Seminar to be conducted during the second week.

After the evening meal at 6:00, the group assembles for a vesper service at 7:00 which is followed by a second message by E. Stanley Jones. An hour intervenes between his message and the period of silence which begins at 9:30 and continues until the 6:30 service the following morning. No one is expected to speak with another during this time of silence, which the group imposes upon itself as one of the Ashram disciplines.

An Ashram differs from a conference in that instead of trying to find verbal answers, the Ashram attempts to *be* the answer. In other words, the Ashram seeks to produce in individual and corporate life a miniature of the Kingdom of God. It will be imperfect, of course, for the people are imperfect, but there is a difference in outlook when you are trying to *be* the answer rather than trying to find the answer.

During the Ashram, the members are encouraged to write suitable mottoes to hang on the wall of the meeting room. These reflect the spirit and the purpose of the Ashram. This one is a help to any group—

"Fellowship is based on confidence,
Secret criticism breaks that confidence.
Therefore, we shall renounce all secret criticism."

Perhaps the motto most often referred to is, "Christ is the *guru* (teacher) of this Ashram." This motto indicates something of the Ashram fellowship which says, "Unbreakably given to each other and unreservedly given to God." And so the spirit of the Ashram is centered about Christ as its teacher, as its leader and as its guide.

On the human side, there has been an incalculable contribution throughout on the part of E. Stanley Jones, who has helped to work out and adapt the program for America in the light of his vast experiences in Ashrams in India. All those who have attended during the last two years call him "Brother Stanley," and that with genuine affection. It has been fortunate indeed that he has been able to be in this country for the last two summers in order to render this invaluable assistance. His messages alone have been an inspiration.

It is recognized that the Ashram in *front* of Christ may be a stumbling block, but *behind* Christ as a servant of the Church, for the extension of the Kingdom of God, it may be a remarkable contribution. The Ashram is not an end in itself, but a means to the end of the Kingdom.

The Via Media of Paul Elmer More

DAVID WESLEY SOPER

WILLIAM LYON PHELPS, who enjoys distinction as an evaluator of letters, classed Paul Elmer More as "the most learned man in America." Without surrendering with emotional abandon to the use of this exalted, if sweeping, superlative, Doctor Phelps has captured much of the truth in his characterization.

Professor More's far-ranging scholarship, psychological insight, humanistic viewpoint and luminous, penetrating style of writing brought him to the foreground of the intellectual world. He regarded man neither as subhuman in helpless dependence upon the weltering currents in the flux nor as one with God in a Plotinian pantheism. He took his stand simply on "being human."

Born in St. Louis, Missouri, in 1864, he died at Princeton in 1937. During this time he produced writings which will live as the finest accomplishment of his time in American literary criticism and, as well, in the philosophy of the Incarnation.

THE WORLD WAR WITHIN—DUALISM

Doctor More once was accused by H. L. Mencken, and others of similar philosophic tone, of the attempt to measure all things with a kind of "cosmic footrule." More replied that his position was in diametric opposition to the various Demons of the Absolute, yet that the common experience of mankind had brought to the surface certain judgments called standards without which life and literature could be chaos—certainly neither liberty nor sense. More's reply was correct and it beheaded Mencken, for Mencken's muscular cynicism, his Demon of the Absolute, was precisely a cosmic footrule of rationalism. In fact, it was the temperament of decadent romanticism raised to a logic-ridden formula, the half-truth of skepticism exalted to the dethronement of reason.

Yet in a nobler sense More did hammer out a standard of criticism, even, if we insist, a cosmic footrule. This was transparent in its simplicity yet world-embracing in its mature occupation of all the space between two distinct and irreconcilable contraries.

"Anyone who looks deeply into his own heart must recognize there two distinct principles governing his life—the will to act, and, let us not say the will to renounce,

for fear of misinterpretation—but rather the will to refrain; and on the right understanding of these two faculties depends largely our insight into much that is best and much that is worst in literature.” (pp. 116-117, *Shelburne Essays*, Second Series, 1907.)

More's use of the history of thought may, with justice, be said to be based upon this paradoxical dualism in the nature of man. Later this innate dualism, at first conceived by More as a principle entirely within nature, that is, based upon a nonteleological view of the world, became to him the springboard through intuition and faith to a complete teleological world view. It was supported at first by the Platonic thought development from Ideas to Demiurge to transcendent God laboring against the Dark Necessity, but found itself at last in the historic fact of the Incarnation, and fulfilled in the mediatorial dualism of the Catholic Faith. But dualistic paradox it is from first to last, and it is the key which opens the door to the hidden things of all questioning minds. Cosmic footrule it is, not in jest, but in truth, and it is by no means a rationalistic formula but an intuitional experience, held in intellectual humility.

More's account of the story of dualism begins, it appears, in the Forest Philosophy of India. Born a Calvinist it is understandable that the reacting More set about in the earlier years with bristling scholarship and grim determination to find truth elsewhere than in the Old Testament. There, in Jesus' only university, he might have found a more ancient source of the moral dualism of mankind than anything available in India. Yet in India he did begin, and found among the Upanishads, those utterances of the elderly enlightened ones, wandering through the Indian forests, who had abandoned the symbols of priestly ritual for the self-sufficient life of the spirit, the deep awareness of irreconcilable dualism.

“The clearness with which this dualism has been perceived marks the depth of any religion or philosophy. Religion, one would say, was just the acceptance of this cleavage in our nature as a fact, despite the cavilling of the intellect, together with a belief that the gulf may be bridged over by some effort of the will, by self-surrender to a Power in one sense or another not ourselves. Philosophy is an attempt to explain away this dualism rationally, and literature, in its higher vocation at least, often asserts the same prerogative by virtue of the imagination. But in one way or another, by the fervor of acceptance, by the very vehemence of denial, by the earnestness of the endeavor to escape it, this dualism lies at the bottom of our inner life.” (p. 18, *Shelburne Essays*, Sixth Series, 1909.)

Released from many false hopes, More turned from modern philosophies of sympathy and humanity-worship, and from what he early called

the effeminacy of Christianity, back to Socrates and Plato in whom he found the true dualism of India come to fuller expression. He rejected Plato's teleological dualism, calling it pointless mythology. This position he later reversed in *The Skeptical Approach* and *The Greek Tradition*. Yet the Platonist in More's early delineation—

"will retain a reverence for traditional religion as for one of the illusions without which mankind sinks into the slough of the senses. He will be no humanitarian, casting the responsibility of his sins upon some phantom perversion of society and looking for redemption to some equally phantom work of social sympathy. He will feel the compassion of the world; but he will be convinced that the fateful struggle for him, as for each man, lies within his own nature and is for the possession of himself." (pp. 354-355, *Ibid.*)

This Stoic strain in More's earlier dualism is amply offset by his later recognition that without teleology, i. e., the cosmic, long-range plan or purpose of a transcendent Person, dualism itself becomes naturalistic monism, yielding in spite of itself to the bright but illusory half-truth of rationalism's closed circle; an insight seemingly never granted to More's great friend, Irving Babbitt, who continued with vigor to find the One within the Many in true nineteenth-century Darwinian fashion.

Discounting More's oversight of Judaist, Zoroastrian and Confucian primary sources of dualistic awareness, it is nevertheless quite clear that his dualism, i. e., the war of the One and the Many within man's consciousness, is established upon a firm foundation in India and Greece.

The paradoxical dualism of Athanasius and Augustine, of Pascal and Port Royale, maintaining at once the sovereignty of God and the responsibility of man, held out heroically against the rationalistic monisms of Arius, Pelagius, and the Jesuits, yielding faith to reason—yet human lethargy, the indolence of the extremes, has made us all Arians, Pelagians and Jesuitical Casuists today. Indeed, Pascal was in a profound sense the last Christian, for—

"Here (that is, in Pascal and 'The Pensees'), if anywhere, Christianity rises into the thin, intoxicating atmosphere of pure religion. There has been no such expression of reasoned faith from his day to ours." (p. 153, *Ibid.*)

According to More a truer intuition of dualism would have given Thomas Aquinas greater humility before the intellectual impotence of irreconcilable contraries. A like intuition would have had its influence on Bunyan who, instead, yielded to a suffocating literalism which was nothing more than hard rationalism, "closing the superstitious eye of love," the

same in quality, strangely enough, as the equally rigid, though reverse, absolute of Rousseau's natural goodness of man.

Others fell in the same track. Milton succumbed to the Nessus shirt of Deism, that logic-ridden Demon of the Absolute, and his "Paradise Lost" is but nostalgia for utopia. Jonathan Edwards in Puritan New England rode logic to the devil, and caused to disappear before your very eyes into his rationalistic conjuror's hat the freedom of will known to intuition. Emerson refused to believe in Carlyle's Devil and cleared the way for the Demon-ridden fallacy of Mrs. Eddyism. Nietzsche and Marx are but opposite Demons of the Absolute, each pursuing an alternate coattail of the Rousseauistic substitution of non-moral social dualism for the inward moral war. Bryon, Keats, Shelley and Wordsworth succumbed to pantheistic reverie, the substitution of decadent emotion for judgment, and lost the saving paradox of dualism.

And finally, first and second World Wars are but the surrender of the dualistic paradox to the absolute of Might and Want over Right from Darwin through Nietzsche, Treitschke, Bernhardt and *Mein Kampf*.

With Plato, More would say, "Show me a man able to see both the One and the Many in nature (i. e., one who steadfastly holds before his eyes the dualistic paradox confounding all rationalistic systems), and I will follow in his footsteps as though he were a God!" (p. 302, *The Drift of Romanticism*, Shelburne Essays, Eighth Series, 1913.)

A MEANINGFUL UNIVERSE—DUALISM AND TELEOLOGY

There are two kinds of inferential knowledge, one from observed data external to the soul, whether in the lower nature in man or in nature beyond man; the other from that intuition, common to the experience of all men, of freedom, purpose and responsibility—an intuition of that part of man within yet everlastingly above the phenomenal world.

Every man knows himself to be not only dual but purposing. "The teleology of conscience is universal." (p. 5, *Skeptical Approach to Religion*, 1934.

Observation of phenomena establishes contact with "a set of facts not only different from, but contrary to, the facts of intuition." (p. 6, *Ibid.*) No purpose is visible in the blind mechanism apparent to phenomenal observation. Purpose, freedom, responsibility—all these are immediately known to intuition.

Rationalism by inference from phenomenal observation comes to monistic determinism. James's Pluralism is but the surrender of the dualistic paradox and a teleological world-view to the flux, the substitution of the Many for the One. In Pluralism, "Whirl is King, having driven out Zeus."

Faith by inference from the data of intuition comes to teleology. Either wager is pure inference, the one from the data of material observation, the other from the data of moral intuition. But faith is the more reasonable for it does not deny but transcends and grounds the data of observation.

Pascal's significant emphasis on "the necessity of the wager" is the central text of More's attack on the illusion of detachment. In fine, there are two possible wagers (every man *does* make one or the other), one from the observed data of the phenomenal world issuing in a denial of cosmic purpose, the other from the data of moral intuition issuing in acceptance of the Divine Person.

Any rationalism, proceeding to erect a scaffolding of logic from an a priori assumption, is a wager, a faith. So also is religion. Rationalism wagers against the existence of a cosmic purposing Agent, since it begins and ends solely with the facts of the phenomenal world, which appears a purposeless mechanism. Religion wagers for the existence of a personal and responsible God, since, while not denying the phenomenal world, it proceeds from the purpose, responsible freedom of the human spirit.

Skepticism, then, rather than being the enemy of faith, is faith's right arm, for moral responsibility clearly accompanies intellectual impotence. I do not know, but I believe. Thus from the elimination of the data of intuition and exclusive preoccupation with the data of phenomenal observation, the rationalist wagers against teleology, while, from the moral data of the human spirit, the man of religion comes to faith.

There are three kinds of skeptics. The first raises his very skepticism to a logic-ridden absolute and refuses to think. The dogmatic agnostic who stoutly declares that he knows nothing then proceeds to pontificate on his acceptance of the facts of observation and his denial of the facts of intuition. The third accepts both observation and intuition, comes by faith to interpret the world teleologically. Of these three, he alone is the keeper of the paradox which is the key of the Kingdom.

The moral dualism known to intuition accepts by faith a free and

responsible agent whose moral purpose is operative in the world while He Himself is transcendent to the world; in brief, God who labors to work out His design against the dark resistance. Before Socrates and after Plato in Greek thought there was no teleology, no belief in a super-human purposing Agent, no recognition of the distinct One set everlastingly above the Many.

"We have the astonishing fact that Socrates and Plato appear suddenly and inexplicably as a contradiction to the prevalent trend of their age and people. It may be true that their ideas correspond with the ethical basis of tragedy, and are thus intrinsically Athenian; but among the professed philosophers of Greece all those who preceded Socrates are nonteleological in their outlook, as are all those who followed Plato. They stand in this respect utterly alone, shining like a gleam of light in the vast encompassing darkness, a kind of illusory dawn which, for Greece at least, brought no day." (pp. 29-30, *Ibid.*)

Anaxagoras, it is true, had broken with the Ionian monists in his doctrine of "nous," mind or reason or governing principle, but unlike Plato and Socrates he left the origin of "nous" in ambiguity. Was the "nous" of the One or of the Many?

In the Platonic dialogue, *Phaedo*, Socrates describes his relationship to his prison cell. The physical elements in the situation were mere conditions. The cause was Socrates' own will and choice, a matter of inner freedom, known to intuition.

Going on from this beginning, Plato developed his true moral dualism from the immature Doctrine of Ideas to a full theistic teleology. In the *Gorgias*, the Doctrine of Ideas is held tenaciously. In *The Republic*, the Ideas become independent of creation. In the *Timaeus* the Ideas are subordinated to God as Efficient Cause of creation. And at last, in the *Lysis*, the Ideas are utterly subordinated to the Divine Agent. The final Platonic picture is one in which the Lord of creation labors against the dark necessity with His eye upon the eternal pattern.

From a misunderstanding of Plato Hobbes obtained his distinction between man in state of nature, brutish and lustful, and man under social convention, semicivilized. Reversing this false distinction, Rousseau gave the world the doctrine of the natural goodness of man, corrupted only by civilization. Both ignored the inner Platonic dualism, and the Platonic teleology, based on the data of moral intuition, for alternate systems of mechanistic determinism, based on the data of material observation.

From his study of the Platonic teleology, More concludes,

"Plato, following the hint of Socrates' rejection of the fatalistic theories of his predecessors for the liberty of intuition, wrought together the new Philosophy of Ideas and the ageless tradition of Religion into a splendid allegory of cosmic teleology." (pp. 93-94, *Ibid.*)

Throughout history, metaphysical abstraction, proceeding from the data of external observation, has served only to destroy dualism, based on the data of intuition, for the greater glory of the flux and the dethronement of Zeus.

"The quasi-religious metaphysics of Spinoza and Kant simply crumples up under the acid test of skepticism. If any one lesson can be surely learned from Kant as well as from Spinoza, it is that the endeavor to escape the human condition of intellectual impotence ends invariably in a denial of human responsibility. . . . Between religion and metaphysics there is a deep gulf fixed and an irreconcilable feud. The bottom of that severing abyss is strewn with the wrecks of noble efforts to throw a bridge over the broken trail, from the Great Scholastics of the Middle Ages to such more recent champions of rationalized religion as Bradley and Pringle-Pattison and James Ward and our esteemed contemporaries, Professors Whitehead and Hocking." (p. 116, *Ibid.*)

The Hebrews believed that God had delivered them from Egyptian bondage. By faith they looked forward to a future deliverance by God under Messiah, and in answer to their faith there are only two alternatives: on the one hand, a dying echo of illusion in which the world yields neither purpose nor meaning; or, on the other, the true telos of Hebraic hope in the coming of the Son of Man.

Teleology stands or falls with a two-sided question: is it the author of the universe and of us who beckons to us from Bethlehem and Calvary, or but another desert wanderer? Is there a rescuing author, or is the world self-created and quite without meaning? As Platonism is the only independent teleological philosophy, so Christianity is the world's only complete teleological religion. From creation itself, the telos of the Christian revelation is the conscious aim of the cosmic Agent.

It is, of course, always possible to extract teleology from Christianity, reducing high religion of soul-peace to sociological statistics.

"Liberal theology—I use the phrase in its narrow technical sense—is not buried; you will find it still taught in certain of our seminaries which boast of being very advanced, but which in fact have stuck at the point reached by criticism in the year 1900." (p. 143, *Ibid.*)

The substitution of a few neat little moralisms for the supernatural credulities of the primitive Church is beginning to be discovered. It is

no longer a question of history, but of faith. Each man must answer as he will. Jesus is either self-deluded fanatic, in which case there is no Christianity, or Christ the Lord. Sentimental sociology is but a pale substitute for the Catholic dogma of the incarnation and the Catholic sacrament of the eucharist.

Eschatology, at the last, is but a further development of teleology, for

"Religion must rest on this as a fact, that in the historic event recorded in the New Testament the ascending scale of revelation reached its climax. It may be that the Second Coming of the Lord and the establishment of His Kingdom will be just such a rending away of the veils of nature through which the Word has always spoken to faith; but even so we may believe that nothing will be changed in the significance of the Incarnation-as the Telos of Prophecy." (p. 168, *Ibid.*)

The faith of a separate nation was answered by the Incarnation. Similarly, the fidelity of the Church as a separate people within the world will bring to final realization the Parousia and the Messianic Kingdom.

Christianity's great gift to mankind is not love, which is a command and a choice quality of the soul, but *hope*, impossible outside faith in a free, purposing and responsible God—a faith issuing from the known purpose, freedom and responsibility of intuition. The agnostic terms faith but wish-belief, but the true skeptic will find it to be the Socratic summons to a great adventure, "Fair is the prize, and the hope great."

"The Incarnation, the descent of the Word into this harassed realm of mortality, was the great adventure of God, spurred by the hope, if the phrase be not blasphemous, of reaching and redeeming His creatures fallen almost into despair. So would hope answer to hope." (p. 194, *Ibid.*)

VIA MEDIA—DUALISM, TELEOLOGY AND THE CATHOLIC FAITH

More's dualistic paradox of interrelated yet irreconcilable contraries, known directly to every man by his intuition of the antagonistic principles of impulse and veto power within himself, formed the basis of his cosmic teleology. So, too, both his dualism and his teleology became the creedal and moral strength of his Catholic Faith, the Via Media which is the distinguishing "direction" of nobler Anglicanism, yet as well the available "way" of all men.

Historically, true dualism of the One and the Many was the basis of the Socratic revolution and of its Platonic development. Moral dualism, known to intuition, was the sound paradox of Plato's Ideal and Phenomenal worlds, coming to full flower at last in the Laws with its

presentation of Plato's final word—God laboring upon the dark necessity with His eyes upon the pattern of righteousness and truth and beauty. Yet somehow the Platonic dualism never found its resolution. More mentions his own belief that Plato was on the point of writing another set of dialogues at the time of his death—to declare his faith in the possibility of some sort of cosmic personal union of Ideal and Phenomenal worlds, a Platonic conception of the dogma of the "Word made flesh." Whatever may have been Plato's intent, however, such a volume was never written, and mankind found no true day in the Platonic false dawn. True as had been the paradoxical and cosmic dualism of Plato, its insights were lost to view among his successors, and came again to appear only in the Dogma of the Incarnation which struggled with external and internal monistic heresies till its final dualistic and orthodox formation at the Council of Chalcedon at 451 A. D.

From Plato to Christ, cosmic teleological dualism lost its way in the swamps of the many false absolutes of rationalism: the monism of Aristippus of Cyrene, advocate of complete surrender to the spell of any moment in the flux; of Epicurus, materialist and hedonist, the "liberty without security" rationalist; of Zeno and of Epictetus, the lame schoolman of Nicopolis, advocates of "security without liberty," of noble but essentially dull Stoic self-sufficiency; of Plotinus, the absolutist and rationalist of the spirit; of Diogenes of Sinope, the intellectually lethargic cynic of naturalism's closed circle; and of Pyrrho of Elis, who made an absolutist Demon of skepticism. (Cf., "Hellenistic Philosophies," Vol. II, *The Greek Tradition*, 1923.) No salvation for man lay in these conjurers who caused to disappear with clever intellectual legerdemain one half of truth's perennial paradox, who left the world with a rationalistic monism possessing the convenience of apparent simplicity but not wisdom.

The fact of the Incarnation brought together in one historic person that other-worldliness and morality joined by Plato only in a philosophy.

"In that union of two natures, Divine and human, in one Person, a complete philosophy will discern, enacted as it were in a cosmic drama, the last expression of the mystery, the beginning of which lies in the dualism of mind and matter." (p. 24, "The Christ of the New Testament," *The Greek Tradition*, Vol. III, 1924.)

The era from Christ's early life to Chalcedon is but the continued story of tempting rationalistic heresies, the logic-ridden monisms of divinity or humanity, and of Christendom's heroic victory in Chalcedon,

where Plato's cosmic moral dualism found completion in the "two natures in one person" statement of the Tome of Leo. Herculean efforts failed to escape through monistic logic from the basic dualism of the Incarnation. Gnostics failed to make of Christianity a noble branch of Theosophy. Marcion failed to reduce Christianity to sympathy, or has he finally come into his own? Both Sabellians and Arians failed to deny the Incarnation on the grounds of the essential unity of God. After Nicea and its establishment of the Incarnate Son as distinct from the Father, the nature of Christ's humanity became the controversy. Nestorians failed to establish the dual personality of Christ. Monophysites failed to convince Christendom of the singleness of His nature. The Antiochan Paul of Samosata failed to destroy the unity of Christ's personality, and the Laodicean Apollinarius failed to destroy His manhood.

Chalcedon brought true order out of the chaos of monistic rationalisms in the Athanasian dualistic orthodoxy, "As the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ." (p. 241, "Christ The Word," *The Greek Tradition*, Vol. IV, 1927.)

The universal faith of the Church thus rests upon the basic dualism of the Incarnation; and, because of the Incarnation, upon the sacramental and redemptive symbolic re-enactment of the cosmic drama in the Eucharist. The two fundamentals, then, of the Catholic Faith, are the Incarnation and the Eucharist. All other church doctrines are accessories, perhaps useful, perhaps harmful, but in any case not central.

As the Church Universal, the voice of tradition, unites around the Incarnation and the Eucharist, so it unites similarly in a mediatorial direction, sacramental in nature, between the twin rationalistic monisms of pure mysticism on the one hand and pure materialism on the other.

Paradoxical dualism is the guide all the way, beginning in an incomplete and unstable nonteleological setting, finding its way through intuition to cosmic teleology, and reaching fulfillment and flower in the "Word made flesh" and the Via Media of the Catholic Faith.

It is understood that More, as he drew near to the end, drew near also to a fuller perception of the redemptive character and purpose of the Incarnation, completing its meaning in the Cross and the Empty Tomb, and similarly to a clearer perception of the personality of the Holy Spirit as the corrective Presence within the Church Universal.

Whether or not you feel that a philosophy not of rationalistic but

of personal monism resolves the moral dualism inherent in man and the world, that personal monism, at the very heart of More's doctrine of the Incarnation—"two natures in one person"—can never with either honesty or safety lose from the center of its meaning More's definitive dualism, the ground of intellectual humility and moral responsibility.

"In every field of experience, if I push my analysis to the end of my resources, I find myself brought up against a pair of irreconcilable, yet interrelated and interacting, contraries, such as 'good' and 'bad,' 'mind' and 'body,' the 'One' and the 'Many,' 'rest' and 'motion.' The dualist is one who modestly submits to this bifurcation as the ultimate point where clarity of definition ends. Beyond this he refuses to follow reason in its frantic endeavor to reconcile these opposites by any logical legerdemain in which one of the controlling factors of consciousness is brought out as an Absolute while the other disappears in the conjuror's hat." (p. 18, "Marginalia I," *The American Review*, Vol. VIII, No. 1, Nov., 1936.)

If the Catholic faith in the "Word made flesh" be not true, if God, and the other world, and the hope of salvation at the last, are collapsing scaffoldings of rationalized illusion, "Without these the universe becomes no sorry jest, as you would courteously deem it, but a purulent cancer on the corpe of nonentity." (p. 2, Chapter XXVII, "Pages From An Oxford Diary, 1937—Posthumous.") Or again, "Christianity may seem to have failed in so many ways; but this one thing it has effected, the offering of hope, the long hope, to the souls of individual men." (p. 29, "Marginalia," cited.)

In the words of Aeschylus' chorus of Agamemnon, "Sing woe! Sing woe! But let the good overcome." (p. 30, *Ibid.*) Or, the ultimate Voice above all tumult, "In the world ye shall have tribulation; but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world." (*Ibid.*)

With More, we bow our hearts before the Cross—

"As often as I have read these chapters (describing the Crucifixion) in all my years from early childhood, I cannot now approach them without being moved to the innermost. . . . Who was He that in the hour of death forgot the desertion of His disciples, forgot His hopes and transient victories, but not His Divine claims, 'My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' He knew then the full meaning of our mortal lot, as otherwise He could not have known it, and, knowing that, died in amazement." (pp. 170-171, "Christ of the New Testament," cited.)

War and Evolution

WILLIAM HARMON NORTON

WAR and evolution are close and old associates. When war is brought before the high court of the public conscience it pleads its essential part in the evolutionary process. Evolution is charged with being war's accomplice, a Jekyll readily transformed to Hyde. In any trial of the one the other is apt to be called as a material witness by both the prosecution and the defense. The long-lasting results of war are those which affect the biologic and social evolution of our race whether for good or evil.

The evolutionary roots of war strike deep. They rise from the predatory hungers of the first life on earth—hungers hardly more purposive than that of the flame of the candle for the carbon of the wax and the oxygen of the air—and from defenses as primitive as the stinging cells of the lowly Hydrozoa.

On its long road from the protein molecule to man—and war—life has built countless structures and behavior patterns for attack and defense. The weapons of combat became progressively more formidable with the advance of the vertebrates from fish to reptile. From these forebears mammals inherited fang, claw, horns and armor plate and the fighting instincts.

For geologic ages the struggle for existence involving combat was limited to individuals. But with the coming of the mammal and the mammalian family group defense became an equal concern of evolution. The same high premiums were still placed on bodily strength and vigor, courage and the indomitable will. But evolution now developed a different set of virtues. Parental care, loyalty, sympathy, mutual aid, self-sacrifice, such were the instincts and behaviors which evolution now judged among the fitter to survive in group selection. They were indispensable in the organization and integration of the group, in its effective functioning and for its defense. The group which failed for want of these virtues to defend its young, presently had no young to defend and perished off the earth.

Concurrently the mammals evolved a new defense mechanism; the

threat of attack evoked an emotional response which called into action the pituitary master gland and other ductless glands. The messages carried by their hormones roused the heart to quicken its beats and the liver to throw additional fuel into the blood stream to provide the energy needed for the struggle at hand. These mechanisms slowly wrought out by evolutionary processes in the geologic past, now stiffen the sinews, summon up the blood, when the battleship *Maine* is blown up, when Warsaw, Rotterdam or Pearl Harbor is laid waste.

The defense of the family group fell particularly on the sire. Even in the most inoffensive species he was given for this duty the will to fight at need and a self-sacrificing devotion. The kangaroo, for example, is a timid creature whose normal strategy is flight. He has neither claws, horns, hoofs, carnassial teeth, nor armor. Yet when the hunt is on Old Man Kangaroo stands his ground, fighting off the dogs as best he can, until his family has fled to safety. In the grand strategy of evolution the reptiles were defeated largely for the same reasons that nations today go down: for lack of cohesion and effective group defense. The mammals triumphed and their columns deployed over the face of the earth largely because evolution had given them the integrating virtues of survival value. Weakness, cowardice, nonresistance in the natural defenders of family, tribe or nation, are sins inexorably punished by the elimination of the entire group.

With the coming of man, defense became a matter of intelligent choice, approved by conscience and religion. No conduct has been so universally honored throughout human history as that of the defender of home and country, and none so universally scorned as that of the slacker who comes not up to the help of the Lord against the mighty. We lay our wreaths upon the tomb of the Unknown Soldier as the representative of all who gave their lives that the national group might live and that all the achievements in civilization which it holds in trust might be preserved. There are perhaps other religions which may preach and practice nonresistance, but certainly not Judaism with its exaltation of the other-regarding virtues, not Christianity, the religion of self-sacrifice, whose symbol is the Cross.

War is conditioned by the cohesive, altruistic virtues of the group, and it reacts on these same virtues, quickening them to a new vigor. The onset of war, as we have had opportunity to observe all too often, is marked

by an upsurge of idealism. Men work together, endure and die together with a devotion almost religious.

The crest of the wave is especially marked when, as now, it rises from the trough following an earlier war, a trough of indifference, defeatism, cynicism and general slump, when the Spirit which Denies holds sway, when all wars seem futile and the Unknown Soldier and his supporters are called gullible fools, when good men take refuge in prophetic visions and the Church is tempted to retreat to the desert and some pacifistic pillar.

But with the recurrence of war men face evil with the heroism inherited from the distant past. Cynics change to patriots. Students once pledged not to fight for King and country now defend King and country in the skies over their island home, on distant deserts and in still more distant jungles. Conscientious objectors forget the lessons taught them. Churches again resolve to loyally support their country. Good men still hold by their prophetic vision of a warless world just as physicians hold by theirs of an earth without epidemics, but when a war or an epidemic is on both resolutely take up the present task undiverted by visions of the future.

The value of war in promoting national unity, brotherhood and self-sacrifice is not offered as an excuse for war. Epidemic, earthquake, fire and flood also evoke sympathy and mutual aid, but they are not welcomed because of these calamity values.

So far our argument has taken account only of defensive war. Wars differ in motives, objectives and procedures. Surely in the war now raging a distinction may be made between the attackers and the attacked. Evolution, which tests all things but most tenaciously holds fast that which is good, surely sanctions a war in which nations join to save from destruction the highest achievements of civilization.

* * * * *

While man is thus amply provided with the group virtues necessary for the struggle, he is singularly ill-equipped for battle, so far as bodily weapons are concerned. His canine teeth are too short to serve as fangs, none of his incisors develop into tusks. His thin, flat nails cannot tear and rend like claws. Except in art—I am thinking of Michelangelo's Moses—man wields no horns. Evidently he is not fashioned for aggression.

All this is because man is a primate and inherits the structures evolved

by his primate ancestors. When the early primates emerged from their humble forebears, the insectivores, they took refuge in the trees, where they were fairly safe from the carnivores of the ground. Thus they escaped the fiercer aspects of the struggle for existence, and the need for the special weapons developed by the struggle in other orders.

During the millions of years of the Tertiary primates increased in size, in brain-cube and the integration of the group—the union in which their strength has always lain. Thus when man's precursors for various reasons came down to the ground they were able to cope with the most formidable predators of the time.

Yet earth was still a warless world. Blood of course was shed and flesh devoured, Nature was still "red in tooth and claw with ravine." But war is something more than the natural process by which young lions are given their food. War among the vertebrates waited until a mammal appeared able to foresee and foreplan, and social groups larger than the family were capable of united effort.

The first hominids were probably simian in disposition as well as in a number of physical characters, resembling thus our nearest congeners, those peaceful kindly folk of the tropic forest. But early men were hardly the innocent, playful children they are sometimes portrayed. No doubt they were capable of sudden, uncontrolled rages. A certain skull of a Neanderthal old woman was hardly pierced in play. Some hundreds of thousands of years ago the submen of a Pekin cave seem to have been fond of human brains as food.

We can hardly dignify as war the incidental combats of these subspecies of men with one another and with *Homo sapiens* when he appeared. But whatever name we give the struggle we must recognize the fact that it prevented the simian genes of the first hominids from infecting the race today.

As families grew to tribes, conflicts were planned and waged on a larger scale. Tribes of adjacent mountain valleys engaged in indecisive battles. Desert tribes set out on midnight razzias. With geographic changes such as dessication, with population pressures and the progressive organization of the State, there were invasions, conquests, professional armies with chariots of iron and other professional weapons. War indubitably had arrived.

* * * * *

But it was not until a plausible theory of evolution was proposed that war and evolution became associated in men's minds. In 1859 there was published a book by one Charles Darwin offering good evidences of the evolutionary process and proposing as its major factor natural selection, the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. Thenceforth war could be viewed as an aspect of social evolution, the struggle for existence between states. Thus in Darwinism war apparently found excuse and motive.

Sixty years later, biologist Raymond Pearl¹ called the publication of the *Origin of Species* "a highly important cause" of the World War of 1914. "German statesmen and political philosophers . . . presently saw the great possibilities which the principle of natural selection offered in fostering and developing in the minds of the people the militaristic ideal, the will to conquer." . . . "This same glorious principle that the fittest survive, and its converse that the survivor is the fittest have been the cornerstones on which modern Germany has been built."

Undoubtedly the warmongers of Germany, especially after the turn of the century, made use of neo-Darwinism to rationalize the war lust of the nation, "the systematic cultivation of the war spirit" of which in 1913 Professor Nippold, of Jena, gave so many examples in his book, *Der Deutsche Chauvinismus*, "the literally mad infatuation, the romantic dream of world power and the unscrupulous militarism" to which in 1940 Professor F. W. Foerster allotted a chapter in his *Europe and the German Question*.

"War is biological necessity." "The struggle for existence is the basis of all healthy development in the life of Nature. So in the life of man the struggle is not merely the destructive, but the life-giving principle." "War gives a biologically just decision." War is a "moral obligation." "Might is right and the dispute as to what is right is settled by the arbitrament of war." It was by such teachings as these familiar quotations from Bernhardt that in the decades preceding the first World War Germans were constantly incited to prove their fitness to survive by wars of conquest.

But the mounting flame on which the neo-Darwinian fuel was thrown had been kindled long before. Valhalla was not built on survival values. The Great Elector and Frederick the Great did not need evolutionary sanctions to put their armies in the field. The Prussian wars with Den-

¹ Pearl, *Biology and War*, p. 545.

mark, Austria and Bavaria, and with France, would hardly have been averted had Bismarck been a LaMarckian or as hostile to evolution as the legislatures of Tennessee.

The collapse of 1918 by no means quenched the Germanic lust for conquest. But the neo-Darwinian motif no longer sounded loud and high in the saga of war. Adolf Hitler indeed chants faithfully the themes of Prussian militarism and the Pan-German movement, so far as conquest, acquisition of territories and political and economic reorganizations are concerned. But the renewal of appeal to scientific theory was not to be expected, considering Hitler's opinion of the intelligence of the masses and the kind of propaganda suited to them. Moreover the logic which identified the defeated with the unfit to survive no longer seemed appropriate to the occasion.

In one respect, however, National Socialism has given back to war the prestige of natural selection. The flaw in the "wooden," "stupid" German logic, as Pearl had pointed out, was this: whatever else war may be a struggle for, it is not a struggle for *existence*. For the defeated in war still continue to exist, still survive. This flaw could be patched up. What was needed was all-out, totalitarian, victorious wars after which the defeated should not continue to exist.

The policy of dispossession of conquered peoples had long been advocated in Germany as a part of the "biological evolution of races." But it remained for Hitler to grasp the full value of the sword as the weapon of selection. "We are obliged to depopulate . . . I mean the removal of entire racial units." . . . "There are many ways of causing undesirable races to die out. Natural instincts bid all living beings not merely to conquer their enemies but to destroy them."² To feel oneself the instrument of evolution in replacing the effete peoples of Europe—and other continents, too, with the Germanic Herrenvolk, much as the marsupials were once replaced over the earth by the placental mammals, is indeed to see visions and dream dreams.

Some of the methods of extirpation already are in use. The concentration camp and ghetto and on a larger scale the crowded areas to which evacuated populations are removed, the confiscation of property, exclusion from business and professions, closing of schools, destruction of leaders, unemployment, malnutrition, unchecked disease, slavery and the breaking

² Rauschning, *Voice of Destruction*, pp. 137, 138.

of the spirit unite to mean the increase of the death rate, the lowering of the birth rate, and at long last perhaps extinction. While scientists debate whether war is or is not dysgenic, Hitler proceeds to prove it highly dysgenic to the conquered.

In fact, National Socialism with its cold deliberate malignity far surpasses natural selection, which is as a-moral as the survival of the hardest pebbles on the beach. Incidentally, a state with a *weltanschauung* of this sort may be expected to try to eliminate the universal religions of mercy and good will which seek the unity of mankind in brotherhood instead of conquest. A *Herrenvolk* needs a racial religion and a racial ethic, each strictly limited.

In the struggle for existence as Darwin himself conceived it, combat, violence, bloodshed, play a relatively small part. There is no fighting when blue grass runs out strawberries in the garden and succumbs to dandelions on the lawn, when the brown rat displaces the black rat in Britain and the rabbit its marsupial rivals in Australia. It was not by brute force that mammals won the struggle against dinosaurs. A single tusk of *Tyrannosaurus* bulked larger than the entire body of a Mesozoic mammal, but to the reptile's huge tusk dripping with blood the tiny mammal opposed its soft breast, and was adjudged by the evolutionary process the fitter to survive. Even predators have their place in a beneficent system. But it must be remembered that evolution here is working with materials not too precious to be sacrificed with prodigal waste.

Moreover, with the advance of genetics since Darwin's time many biologists have found natural selection a conservative rather than a creative principle, "the final arbiter rather than a primary cause." No longer is struggle the Allmacht of evolution. The fountain head now appears to be changes, sudden and decisive, in the genes and chromosomes of the reproductive cells, changes unrelated to any survival values the mutations thus caused may prove to have.

"Such a view gives us a somewhat different picture of the process of evolution from the old idea of a ferocious struggle between individuals of a species, with the survival of the fittest and the annihilation of the less fit. Evolution assumes a more peaceful aspect. New and advantageous characters survive by incorporating themselves into the race, improving it and opening to it new opportunities. In other words, the emphasis may be placed less on the competition between individuals of a species . . . than

on the appearance of new characters and modifications of old characters . . . for on these depend the evolution of the race."³ "Even without Natural Selection evolution might have taken place."⁴ The analogies of organic evolution seem to suggest that social progress comes from social mutations, from discoveries and inventions, new and better ways of life, a higher ethic, rather than from the sifting and destruction of war.

* * * * *

We must note a certain curious relation between war and the evolution of the group. As Spencer long since pointed out evolution proceeds by a closer and closer cohesion, a stronger and still stronger central control. Meanwhile the individuals of the group are more and more deprived of their original liberties and functions. The balance at which the transfer of power from the individual to the group should stop seems to lie with the nature of the individuals concerned. The white ants of the termitary, although deformed and deprived of some of the normal functions of their generalized ancestors, still retain far more freedoms than do the body cells of the metazoan.

Much the same process of centralization has gone on in human society. In the family group *patria potestas* once gave Abraham the legal right to dismiss his wife at will and to kill his son. With the development of personality and the recognition of its worth the freedom of wife and children were at last achieved.

We are now witnessing the rapid evolution of the state and the reciprocal degeneration of the individual citizen in his freedoms and functions. The point of equilibrium between the power of the state and the freedom of the individual is of course still a point in question. Clearly the optimum lies as far to the right of the proper balance in the termitary as man is superior to the insect. For man, the person is quite clearly evolution's supreme goal. His groups are of secondary importance, valuable only as they favor his individual well-being and development. The easy path which makes men stall-fed domesticated animals of the state, or parasites of the body-politic, leads straight down to Avernus.

Gigantism is a phenomenon of both organic and social evolution and in both is a warning of disaster. In human physiology normal growth is insured and gigantism prevented by the action of a certain hormone. The

³T. H. Morgan, *A Critique of the Theory of Evolution*, p. 328.

⁴T. H. Morgan, *The Scientific Basis of Evolution*, p. 131.

remedy for gigantism in the state is known as the love of liberty. But the administration of this hormone has often brought on the fever of war.

The hypertrophied state has a more direct way to war than that of the internal revolutions it may provoke. The struggle between nations is chiefly for economic goods. This struggle may be confined to individuals, including those legal individuals called corporations, and when thus confined cannot be carried on by means of war. Mr. Rockefeller, of Standard Oil, and Mr. Deterding, of Dutch Shell, can put no armies in the field, and no navies on the sea.

But when states take the turn to collectivism war becomes well-nigh inevitable. The State now plans, manages and controls private business. The State takes over private properties, does away with private enterprises, and thus takes over the economic competitions and rivalries of its individual citizens. In the international field the State buys and sells, seeks new raw materials and markets and becomes the direct economic rival and enemy of other states, all able and willing to use the sword and the threat of the sword to promote their business interests.

The socialist cliché, *Capitalism holds war as the thunder cloud holds lightning*, is a quaint inversion, popular among those who do not think. Capitalism, i.e. free enterprise and the private ownership of productive property, diffuses and renders harmless the electricity of economic competition. It is state socialism, or any form of totalitarianism which concentrates that electricity until it flashes forth in the lightning bolt of war. The power of the State grows by war and war grows in direct proportion to the growth of power of the State. Midway the vicious circle. In 1938 Bertrand Russell noted that "the State in every civilized country is far more active now than at any former time; in Russia, Germany and Italy it interferes in almost all human concerns,"⁵ a statement which proved a prophecy of world war. If human society is allowed to clot into collectivism, and individuals surrender their old freedoms war must become wider in range, more destructive, fiercer, and perhaps also more frequent and more prolonged.

To open the doors of trade to the free competition of the citizens of all nations is thus to choose the path to peace. The pax Britannica, now so far behind us, was based upon this system. Singapore protected American tin mines and rubber plantations. In India, Ford and General Motors

⁵ Bertrand Russell, *Power*, p. 168.

built factories and before World War I, Herr Thyssen, German steel magnate, managed there his great properties of mines, furnaces, mills, docks and even a harbor. In a world thus open to private enterprise there can be no have-not nations and few justifiable wars.

The picture changes when the State intervenes, when Mexico confiscates the oil properties of alien owners, when Japan expels Standard Oil from Manchukuo. But the parties aggrieved are powerless, and war does not result unless their own State champions their cause. The effect of State interference was seen in 1914. Germans already had gone far in the economic penetration of Europe, with their mines in the Balkans, banks in Italy and hydroelectric powers even in France. On the ocean their victories in the competitive struggle were still more notable. Just before the fateful opening of the World War the president of Hamburg-American Line recounted its achievements—its routes crossing all the seven seas, its callings at every port. "And now," he concluded, "full steam ahead!" It was one of those tragic ironies in which history indulges. The intervention of the State by war was about to sink the great Line almost without a trace. In recent years Japanese industrialists amply proved their fitness to survive in the competitive markets of the world. But a military state may hazard all the hard-won successes of individual competition by one throw of the dice of war.

The analogies of organic evolution point to the gravest danger in the collectivistic trend. One of the first lessons in evolution's textbook is the effect of specialization. Specialization is a cul-de-sac. The line of ascensive evolution runs up to man through a succession of generalized ancestors. The highly specialized collectivistic state, like the termitary, is a blind end: evolution can go no farther on this line. But totalitarian states, whether national socialist, proletarian socialist or fascist, are natural predators. They are about as well equipped for war as lions are for bloodshed. We know too well that when democracy would contend with totalitarianism on equal terms it must itself go totalitarian for the duration. Predators hunt alone, they do not herd. Pacts between them are worthless. When two lie down together the place of the weaker is proverbially on the inside. The predator's only plan for peace is conquest. But to secure lasting peace it seems that the evolutionary process must pass beyond the State to a new and higher unity, the political integration of mankind. It is only the States whose specialization has not gone too far, which have

preserved the old essential individual liberties, and refuse to enter directly into the economic struggle, that are at all likely to confederate in a world society to secure lasting peace.

* * * * *

The methods of evolution vary with the materials it uses and the levels at which it works. The fact that a certain procedure once was used does not imply or justify its repetition. Terrestrial evolution was begun, as some say, when another star sideswiped our sun, an incident not repeated. Carboniferous swamps and Pleistocene ice sheets were useful in their time, but no one covets their recurrence. Organisms once multiplied by fission but man and other higher animals have found a better way. The evolutionary struggle at the level of the oyster, which spawns sixteen million eggs that two of the progeny may survive to perpetuate the species, does not excuse war's waste of men. At the level of the reptile the sea turtle occasionally returns to the beach to devour its young. At the level of the mammal even carnivores do not prey on those of their own species. At the level of man it is high time that men should cease to destroy by war men and the highest products of civilization.

War already is an anachronism. It belongs to a savage past and survives because something of the savage survives in man. Victorian optimists trusted that civilization with its superior weapons never again would be overthrown by invasions from beyond the pale. They failed to realize that savages might arm themselves with the weapons of civilization and take on its outward forms, but yet retain the treachery and lusts and hates of the savage heart.

Evolution now has reached levels where war is not only useless but destructive of values already gained. The cosmic process has gone on its long way too far now to be turned back. With a possible future for man on earth of millions of years, the material resources of our planetary home are too irreplaceable for war to waste. The apparatus of civilized life is too valuable for war to bomb and burn. Our faiths, our hopes, our loves are too unspeakably precious for war to tear from our hearts. Unless the story of the making of man during one thousand million years is "a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing," evolution will not turn to devour her offspring, man.

It becomes necessary to eliminate war precisely that evolution may go on to higher levels in industry and commerce, in science, pure and applied,

in social organization and even in religion. If the wars now raging are won by the aggressors and set the pattern for future wars, only brute force and the demonic will which wields it will have survival values. Whatever their cultural achievements little nations perish and the great military empires at last lock horns inextricably like stags. In the Peloponnesian war democratic Athens was not saved from defeat and burning at the hands of totalitarian Sparta by her agora and areopagus, the Parthenon, the theater and the groves of the Academy. The public health of Denmark, the social advances of Norway and Sweden, the university of Prague, the library of Louvain, the medical center of Vienna have no power to check the armies of the Sparta of today. The place of Holland and the products of its skill in colonial administration only invite attack. "We need Holland as we need the breath of life," historian von Treitschke taught successive generations of German students and his words have been echoed by Adolf Hitler.⁶

Even in the midst of another of the swiftly recurring episodes of world war, the evolutionary process as a revelation of the Reason incarnate in the world inspires us with hope. The process which once joined living molecule to molecule and cell to cell, which united organisms into families and families into tribes and nations will not cease nor be discouraged. Peoples draw together. There is a growing world community in communication, commerce, the sharing of scientific knowledge and its applications, and more than a beginning of a common culture. The altruistic virtues developed by the in-group reach out beyond frontiers. The common people of all nations glimpse the evolutionary goal of peace on earth, a goal, I need not say, announced long since by the loftiest of religions.

The enemy to be overcome before the goal is reached is war. In fighting any nation, any polity and any leadership which makes war its instrument of competition, we believe that we are fighting on the side of the evolutionary process. We stand at Armageddon with a faith that the victory of our cause will bring nearer the replacement of *Homo necator* by *Homo socialis* and the integration of the race. It is not impossible that the sequence of our victory in a world-wide war may be world-wide peace.

⁶ Rauschnig, *Voice of Destruction*, p. 122.

Preaching and Worship

CYRIL C. RICHARDSON

TO SPEAK of the relationship of preaching to worship might seem to imply a false antithesis between the Word and the Sacrament. It might indeed suggest that preaching was not a part of worship. Such a suggestion I do not want to imply for a moment. The unique contribution of the Protestant and Evangelical traditions has been to elevate preaching to a distinctive place in public worship. The sermon for Protestants corresponds to the Roman Elevation—the holding up of Christ to the congregation. My title must, therefore, be construed in the sense that preaching is itself a liturgical act, and we shall concern ourselves with the relationship between it and the other parts of the service.

THE PRESENT RELATIONSHIP

In modern Protestant worship the sermon without question takes precedence over the rest of the service. It generally lasts from 35 to 40 minutes, thus comprising over one half of the whole service. The architecture of the church well demonstrates the primary place given to preaching by the centrality of the pulpit. The time a minister spends on the preparation of his sermon every week and the time devoted in his seminary training to homiletics all evidence this general trend. Indeed, the service is keyed to the sermon, and the hymns and Scripture lessons are chosen to fit its theme. The other acts of worship thus become the setting for the sermon, and with the exceptions of Christmas and Easter the service is generally related to the individual minister's ideas.

The results of this situation are far from happy. For one thing, the centrality of the sermon has restricted the range and depth of worship. The individual minister is naturally limited in his outlook and his religious understanding. Great preachers are few and far between. Most of us are only mediocre; and the ranks of the clergy always have been and always will be composed of average men. The attempt to set the temper of worship by the individual minister's ideas has thus robbed Protestant liturgy of much of its depth.

Secondly, we have laid our emphasis on the rational aspects of worship. Yet the nonrational elements are just as important, if not even

more so. I need only remind you of Rudolf Otto's brilliant analysis of the *Idea of the Holy* to recall to your minds that the act of worship involves far more than the exercise of man's rational capacities. Worship is concerned with the awakening of the sense of the awful majesty and mystery of God's Presence, and with providing a fitting response to this overpowering Presence of God. It involves man's whole being—the deepest powers of his will and emotion: it passes beyond the merely rational. Not a few of the difficulties of our Christian liberalism, with its emphasis on "intellectual religion," stem from the too exalted place we have given to the sermon discourse in the liturgy. We have lost the depth of the Christian religion because we have too long tried to conduct worship on the level of discursive reason.

The worst result, however, of this emphasis upon the sermon has been the development of a *passive* congregation. They come to hear rather than to do: to listen rather than to act. Kierkegaard well analyzed the disease of our Protestant worship when he said that Protestants regard the church as a theater, the minister as an actor and the congregation as an audience. Our people go to hear a sermon rather than to have traffic with the Living God. Our first criticism of a minister is most often, "He's not much of a preacher." You will recall a greatly debated article in the *Reader's Digest* last year when Channing Pollock told the world why he didn't care to go to church. Whatever was wrong with his article, and there was much,¹ on one score he was dead right: the average minister is quite incapable of delivering fifty-two lengthy discourses worth hearing on religion during the year. If we offer our congregations no more than these sermons, or sermons as central, we need hardly wonder that we have slim congregations. We have cultivated a passive congregation and an attitude toward worship well criticized by Francis Bacon when he wrote (with the Puritans in mind), "Preaching may be magnified and extolled superstitiously, as if the whole body of God's worship be turned into an 'Ear.'" To such an extent has this development of the listening congregation gone that two of the few lay acts of Protestant worship are rapidly disappearing. I refer firstly to the *action* of kneeling at prayer. Nowadays what distinguishes public prayer is often a passive attitude of sitting on remarkably comfortable cushions in our modern pews. Even the Pastoral Prayer has become a sort of miniature sermon.

¹ e.g., His complete lack of appreciation of the need for public worship.

The other act is the lay response of "Amen" to the prayers said by the minister. This has now been usurped by the choir or else is added by the minister to his own prayer, an act which robs "Amen" of its original liturgical meaning.

In contrast to all this let me read you what a laywoman in the Catholic tradition feels about her act of worship.

"To keep house means to exercise, day in and day out, a woman's peculiar talent for doing the same utterly unimportant things over and over again. I am not content with this; I want to say a word that will pierce the heavens and do a deed that will shake the earth. At church a Deed is done and I help do it; there a Word is said, and I help say it. My Word reaches the heart of God and my Deed redeems the world. Consequently, I go to church not to listen or to get, but to give and to do. Spiritual satisfaction? Say rather spiritual effectiveness. Comfort for the soul? Say rather use of the soul."

HOW THIS DEVELOPMENT CAME ABOUT

The significance of the liturgical developments of the Reformation lay in the attempt of the great reformers to restore the right balance between the Word and the Sacraments. Their efforts in that direction were determined by their reaction against what they regarded as the two great evils of late Roman piety. They claimed with some justice that it was magical and individualistic. The liturgies of the reformers were composed to offset the tendencies to superstition in the late Roman mass, and the individualism of such practices as the cult of the reserved sacrament in the later Middle Ages. Their ideal was a central Sunday service of the Word and the Sacrament: The *Word* in order to proclaim God's Evangel against magic and superstition; the *Sacrament* in order by the sacred act to reach those profounder depths of worship, which lie beyond the rational and the intellectual. Furthermore, they emphasized the idea of the *Holy Communion* as a public social act of Christians. The Lord's Supper was not an act of the priest but of the royal priesthood of all believers.

The vicissitudes of Reformation history unfortunately prevented the working out of this ideal. The Lutheran Church remained truer to it than the Calvinist Church, owing to a political reason. Calvin was forced to compromise with the Genevan magistrates on a quarterly communion because riots were feared in the city if the reformers should seem to be re-

² Cited from the *Reader's Digest*, February, 1941, p. 36.

instituting the mass. A second reason for infrequent communion lay in the fact that the laity had been unused to communicating more than two or three times a year. Since the reformers stressed the corporate communion of all the congregation as a *sine qua non* for the Lord's Supper, and since the congregations were averse to partaking frequently, the compromise of a quarterly eucharist was reached. Thus the Sunday service came to entail only half the original liturgy of the early Church. It was a *missa catechumenorum* or a "dry mass." The "Ante Communion Office" of the *Book of Common Prayer* arose from the same circumstances.

Thus the service of the *Word* came to predominate in the Reformed churches. In Geneva one spoke of "aller au sermon," "fréquenter les sermons," and a Lyons refugee in Geneva bitterly remarked: "How glorious is the liberty we enjoy here. Free indeed we were formerly to attend mass, but now we are compelled to hear a sermon."

HOW WE CAN RECOVER THE RIGHT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PREACHING AND WORSHIP

Such is our modern predicament: such are its historical causes. How can we recover the right relationship?

We must first ask: What is the right relationship? This is to raise the fundamental question of the Word and its connection with the Sacrament. What is a Sacrament? In its broadest sense a Sacrament is a sacred act which mediates the presence of God to man. It awakens in him an awareness of the *mysterium tremendum* and provides a fitting response to this experience, through a liturgical act connected with *things* which are able to transcend the power of mere *words*. The sacramental act is charged with the ultimate meaning of man's destiny. His whole being and existence are involved in this meeting with God behind the shadow of things temporal. Thus to participate in right worship implies an act of supreme moment for man's existence—religious life and death are at stake.

There is thus involved in a Sacrament an outward form and a religious meaning, a sacred thing and a divine reality. All great acts of worship are connected with sacramental forms: whether those greatest ones in the Christian tradition as Baptism and the Eucharist consecrated by the acts and promises of Christ, or the other hosts of sacramental acts in which our worship abounds. The very name of Christ has sacramental

import—the music and words of our great hymns, the words of Scripture itself. Thus the distinction of Word and Sacrament is not absolute, for the Word itself has a sacramental significance. For mere convenience, however, we distinguish the great sacramental acts from preaching and the reading of Scripture.

The dangers implicit in all sacramental worship are twofold. On the one hand there is a tendency to identify the form and the reality, which leads to magic and superstition. On the other hand there is a danger of divorcing the form from the reality, which leads to rationalism. We have seen how the reformers had to face the first of these dangers, and the emphasis on the Word was made to offset this late Medieval corruption of Christian worship. Our problem concerns the second danger, for with the emphasis on the rational element in worship we have lost the close and inseparable connection between the sacramental act and the divine reality. We have tended to denude the Lord's Supper of its vital mystery by making it a mere "remembrance feast."

The right relation of Word and Sacrament is only established when we see them as corollaries and interdependent. The Word without the Sacrament tends to become rationalistic: the Sacrament without the Word leads to superstition. Nothing can enhance our modern Protestant worship more than the recovery of the depths of sacramental worship, especially in the Lord's Supper. I do not think we stand in any immediate danger of lapsing into superstition!

Let me suggest some further ways in which we can enrich our Protestant liturgy, and while remaining true to our Protestant heritage overcome the evils which have followed the too exalted place we give to the sermon.

To offset the limitations of the individual minister we must recover the Church Year. This gives balance and historical perspective to worship throughout the year. The central poles are Christmas and Easter and each Sunday is devoted to some aspect of the great Christian tradition. Furthermore, saint's days make us aware of the rich heritage of our Christian past, and the fact that the local church does not stand alone but is part of the great communion of saints in which it shares. New days can be introduced to give religious meaning to the specific needs and expressions of our own national and international life. An excellent popular introduction to the Church Year is Otto Haering's *Living With*

the Church. To offset the rationalistic tendencies of modern worship we must recover the power of sacramental symbolism, especially emphasizing Baptism as a public and not a private Christian act and the Lord's Supper as the realization of the mystery of the presence of the Risen Christ.

We need to teach our laity, moreover, that worship is an *action* and does not merely involve listening to a minister. Among the actions which we should stress are kneeling, the saying of "Amen," the taking of a real part in the offering of gifts (perhaps on the Lord's table), the corporate act of communion, the use of litany forms for congregational response and the introduction of responses into the Pastoral Prayer. This prayer is generally too long to hold the attention of the congregation and is perhaps best divided into shorter separate prayers with appropriate lay responses. One may suggest, moreover, the use of silence as a religious action. But it is well to realize that silence must be directed and the congregation must be given some sense of security as to its length; otherwise they hesitate to begin a meditation, fearing that the silence will be abruptly closed. Perhaps it would be well to have a verse of some appropriate hymn played on the organ as a subconscious guide for the length of the period of silence.

We may now ask what place we are to give the sermon. First it has an educational significance. The deplorable ignorance among Protestants of their faith and of the Scriptures constitutes a sad commentary on our preaching. By its very centrality it ought at least to have disseminated religious knowledge. Educational preaching will prevent any return to magic and superstition in our effort to recover sacramental worship. Preaching also must have its evangelical quality, holding up Christ and His gospel to the people and awakening the sense of God's Presence to be consummated in the act of communion. There is, moreover, a great place for the "liturgical sermon" which fits into the Church's year and helps the laity both to understand some central aspect of the Christian heritage and also to enter into it with their whole soul and life.³

The suggestions I have outlined obviously reflect the mind of one who has been reared in liturgical worship, and I do not for a moment want to advocate that set forms of prayer should supplant the freedom won with such cost at the Reformation. The liturgy of the first three centuries

³ Some constructive remarks on the significance of the liturgical sermon will be found in A. G. Hebert's *Liturgy and Society*, pp. 130-38. He cites *in extenso* from an issue of *Lebe mit der Kirche*.

of the Christian era was characterized by freedom of form within a given structure. Perhaps that is the ideal for which we should strive. One thing, however, is certain. We need to give much more careful attention to our Orders of Service, so that the great acts of public prayer, of singing hymns and psalms and Scripture reading, will not be dwarfed by the sermon.

Finally, I would plead that the Protestant minister should spend at least as much time in preparing his liturgy as his sermon. The freedom he is allowed permits him to enrich his order of worship from the whole range of the Christian heritage, and to adapt it to the modern need and temper. Since the end of all Christian worship is that Christ should be glorified, we can afford to neglect no opportunity or means which the long history of the Church has consecrated, to bring this about. Our personal preferences and predilections must not take precedence in the service of God. As ambassadors of Christ our whole concern should be to deliver His Evangel. If our own tradition and upbringing has been limited and is beset with danger, let us courageously recover much that we have neglected in the past, and furnishing ourselves with the richness of Christ's tradition, bring the whole fullness and glory of the Christian heritage to our people, that to Him may be glory for ever and ever.

The New Order and the New Covenant

JAMES STUART STEWART

BEHOLD, I will make a new covenant." So stands the Word of the Lord in Jeremiah. Today the almost universal slogan is "The new order." The one great hope which, for multitudes of people, is blazing a trail of light across the darkness of these terrible days is the emergence of a postwar new order—in society, in industry and economics, in international relations and, not least, in the Christian Church. It is inscribed today as a watchword on the banners of democracy—a new order.

Is it not vitally important that alongside that watchword there should stand another: a new covenant with God? Where is the new order that will have one atom of survival value if it is not built on spiritual foundations? Can any new order which erects itself on the ruins of the old, without reference to the mind and program of God for humanity, be other than a patchwork and a sham? It is not religious fanaticism; it is plain logic and common sense, to maintain that the issues convulsing the world today are at bottom moral and spiritual issues. "On the plane of the absence of God, men can do nothing else except destroy what they have built—destroy even while they build—build with the elements of destruction." These are the words, not of any ecclesiastical pamphleteer, but of Aldous Huxley. Too often the house has been built upon the sand; and then the rain descended, and the floods came, and the wind blew, and the house crashed—because there was nothing but the shifting sands of human ideals and secular hopes beneath it. And if we are determined to make sure that our next attempt to build Jerusalem in our own national environment and to the uttermost parts of the earth shall have a better fate, then we require not one slogan but two: "The new order" and "The new covenant." In other words, man's reconstructed world based firm upon that Rock of Ages which is God.

It is, therefore, a matter of some moment that we should re-examine this great prophetic conception, and consider its dynamic relevance to our present situation.

It is very significant to observe how the collection of oracles of God bearing Jeremiah's name is coming into its own today. People who have

never read the prophets are apt to suppose their messages to be out of date. In point of fact, they are more up to the moment than the latest news bulletin flashed over the air. Do you seek a vivid interpretation of the will of God for a time of national crisis? You will find that here. Are you concerned about the part that organized religion ought to play in face of the challenge of the economic and social conditions which mold the lives of men? You will find that here. Are you anxious to know what the Church can do in a world at war, what faith can say about the mysteries of providence, what God means by allowing life to be sometimes so terribly difficult for those who take His way? You will find all that here. Jeremiah is relevant, apposite to our situation, in an almost startling degree.

It may be well to remind ourselves of the age to which Jeremiah came, and of the historic background against which his work was done. He was born at the little village of Anathoth, an hour's walk from Jerusalem, about the year 650 B. C. That is to say, he came right at the beginning of one of the most crowded and decisive eras of the national history. He was to see the great religious reformation carried out by King Josiah, a reformation which—inspired by the discovery in the Temple of the law book of the Deuteronomic Code—swept the land clean of idolatry, suppressed the local shrines, and concentrated the national worship at Jerusalem. He was to see the tragic day when the King and all the flower of the nation's youth fell fighting the hosts of Egypt at Megiddo—the Flodden Field of Judah. He was to see Egypt smashed in turn by the rising might of Babylon at the great Battle of Carchemish, and the new menace from the East looming over the land, claiming Palestine as its sphere of influence, and threatening it with infiltration and absorption. He was to see the ancestral religion of his people losing its gripping and compelling power; Judah belying its own constitution as a theocracy, a land where God was king; the wretched incompetence of the Jerusalem Government, the political opportunism and lack of principle, the spiritual blight of the appeasement policy—men covenanting with Egypt and Assyria, as though their prior covenant with the Lord of hosts were a dead letter that had ceased to count—the false prophets prophesying smooth things and saying, "Peace, peace," when there could be no peace. He was to see the substitute deities, the trust in the arm of flesh, the reliance on external securities, the desperate, pathetic attempts of men to buttress up their tottering civilization and to work out their own salvation. He was to see the armored

divisions of the Empire of the Euphrates advancing to the very gates of the capital, and the forcible deportation of the best elements in the city to the concentration camps of Mesopotamia. He was to see, among those who remained, the fatalism and unbelief induced by these remorseless triumphs of ruthless force, the collapse of faith in the divine sovereignty or in any purpose of righteousness, the angry denial of God. Such was the world in which Jeremiah received his call, and such the historic background against which for forty years his work was done.

It is strange that he should have been so persistently misunderstood. In his own day they denounced him as a traitor; actually, he was the truest patriot of them all. They maligned him for a visionary fool; in point of fact, he was an uncompromising realist. They threw him into prison for what they called his subversive propaganda, too blind to see that he was the truest spokesman of God that their age had known. And this tragic misunderstanding still persists. How often the very name Jeremiah is used as a synonym for defeatism and general pusillanimity by people who have obviously never taken the trouble to study his book! How utterly wide of the mark is the conventional idea which pictures him as a lachrymose and ineffectual pessimist, hag-ridden by the gloomy prognostications of a pathological melancholia! The fact is, he was the most vital spiritual force of the pre-Christian world, the greatest religious genius of all the long centuries from Abraham to Christ. It is a point not to be overlooked that when Jesus asked His disciples the question, "Whom do men say that I am?" their answer was, "Some say thou art Jeremiah." He was the most Christlike of all the prophets.

In particular, it is essential to realize the immense significance of his thirty-first chapter, in relation to the whole history of human thought and divine revelation. To say that the message of the new covenant is the climax and the crown of Jeremiah's teaching is to say the least of it. It is far more than that. It is the high-water mark of the Old Testament and the supreme achievement of Hebrew religion. What happened here was nothing less than a revolution, a clean break, in the religious development of the race. At this point, the whole story of man's agelong quest for truth is suddenly—one might almost say electrifyingly—transformed, lifted right up, as by some terrific spiritual thrust or pressure, to new and higher levels; and from this point on it has the sunrise of the gospel in its eyes, and marches right forward on the direct line to Christ.

Observe how this came about. It is possible to reconstruct, with a fair degree of accuracy, the spiritual pilgrimage that led to the culminating revelation; for Jeremiah, more than any other prophet, has laid bare his inmost soul. He stands before readers of his book, not only in the outward events of his life, but in the most intimate struggle of his spirit. We may imagine him soliloquizing in some such way as this.

"Why is this generation in such a plight? Whence come such chaos and darkness upon the earth? Centuries ago, at Sinai, God revealed His mind. God gave His law to Israel. Men were to obey, and peace and brotherhood and prosperity would follow. That was simple enough. And when God first called me to be a prophet, I believed in my ancestral religion. I was sure that the religion of Sinai could be the salvation of my people. I know now it cannot. I have learnt that along that road there lies nothing but disillusionment. Have not I seen with my own eyes the failure of our hopes? There was King Josiah's noble attempt at reformation. There was that great 'Recall to Religion' movement from which I hoped so much, of which I told myself, when it first began, 'You, Jeremiah, must be right in the heart of this, and support it with all your strength and prayers!' And I did. For I had heard its watchword, 'Back to the Law! Back to Puritanism!'—and I believed that here might be the turn of the tide, here the beginning of a new order in Israel. But this, too, petered out; this latest endeavor to reconstruct the national life has failed, like every other. The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved. And it may sound like heresy to say it, but I am beginning to see that my ancestral religion is not enough, that God's pact with the human race at Sinai is not enough, and that all this desperate struggle to build a just and righteous world on the basis of human virtue and obedience is not enough. And what is more, I think I can see the reason why it is not enough. It is not enough, because it has failed to touch the real problem—which is the human heart. It has concentrated on the symptoms, as though they were the disease. It has not reached down to the radical twist and bias in man's will. It has left the central citadel uncaptured. It has tried to construct the new order and build the new Jerusalem out of sinners unredeemed. And it cannot be done. Is there, then, no other way? O God of my fathers, who called me and commissioned me, and thrust me forth to face this time so terribly out of joint—is there no other way? For if not, the race is doomed, and all the prophets dumb.

"But stay! There is another way—a marvelous, transcendent way—and I see it now. Flesh and blood have not revealed it unto me, but my God who is in heaven. I see the next move impending from the side of God. I see God about to change His strategy. God will go now right for that uncaptured citadel of the heart! And when once that central stronghold has been gained, when the human heart is won, the new life will be no longer a burden and a struggle and endless friction and frustration, but joy and spontaneity and perfect freedom! This is God's new covenant, annulling all that went before; and it will inaugurate a new order on the earth."

So we may picture Jeremiah soliloquizing; and so the gospel was anticipated, six centuries before Christ was born.

It is manifestly no far cry from all this to our present dilemma and predicament. What has this decisive insight of Hebraic religion to say to us in a world that is rocking on its foundations?

The answer to that question is implicit in three characteristic features of the new covenant, to which the prophet himself has drawn attention.

First, its *inwardness*. "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." In other words, the world is never going to be redeemed by external rules and statutes. You cannot eradicate evil with a Decalogue. You cannot make men religious by equipping them with cult and creed and ritual observance; nor can you make them good by imposing an ethical standard or a code of conduct and behavior. Through the centuries man's question has been: "How can I win salvation? How can I achieve self-conquest?" This was the question Saul of Tarsus asked in the lecture room of Gamaliel; it was the question that Luther the monk asked in the monastery at Erfurt; it was the question John Wesley asked in the Holy Club at Oxford. Laboriously they hewed out their cisterns—to use Jeremiah's figure—toiling with sweat of body and soul to store up their good works and creditable deeds, their pilgrimages and charities, their asceticisms and austerities. Hence through the dim mists of antiquity you can discern the laden altars, the smoking hecatombs, the ministering priests, the endlessly repeated ritual of incantation, chant and sacrifice, the counting up of moral achievements, the emphasis on personal righteousness—all witnessing to the belief in the efficacy of religious observances and good works for the taking away of sins. But the day came—for Saul, for Luther, for Wesley—when their question, "How can I win salvation?"

was answered from the throne of God. And the answer was: "You can't! Salvation can never be won. Take it for nothing, or not at all!" For the hurt of humanity—the deep-seated malady of man's individual and corporate life—will never yield to treatment which is external and superficial. And Jeremiah—with a daring which startled his contemporaries and would surely startle us, if we really grasped what is involved in it—declared bluntly that therein lay the weakness of the Mosaic régime, and that on the foundations of the legalism of Mount Sinai no kingdom of God would ever be built. Man's very righteousness, being based on self-trust and on a proud, independent reliance on human activity, obstructs God and becomes his basic sin. The more satisfaction his good works give him, the more surely is sin tightening its grip upon him; and so the vicious circle goes on forever.

"I will write my law upon their hearts"—that is what humanity needs, not the mass organization of society or the regimentation of life, not the depersonalizing of the individual that makes him a mere cog in the machine, not the Utopian dream of a kingdom of heaven achieved by the development of civilization and by the scientific mastery of the world, but God's delivering grace penetrating to the hidden source of all our human troubles and frustration, God devising a new and radical strategy to capture that last bastion of self-centeredness and corruption—the heart of man. The divine decisive victory there becomes the hope of all the world.

The second feature of the new covenant stressed by prophetic religion is its *immediacy*. It is not derived or mediated at secondhand; it comes firsthand and direct. "They shall no more teach every man his neighbor, saying, 'Know the Lord'; for they shall all know me, from the least of them to the greatest."

This, too, for those who would play a worthy part in the building of the new order is absolutely vital. The great need is to get beyond a religion that is merely traditional and inherited and derived, beyond a secondhand acceptance of the items of a creed, to a faith that is personal and immediate, and that sees God face to face.

From the days of Moses downward men have dealt with God through intermediaries. They have sent their representatives into the Holy Place, while they themselves have remained outside. They have communed with God by proxy, and believed in the unseen by hearsay. This, declares Jeremiah, is going to end. There is no verve or luster in a faith like that. There

is no thrill in the worship of a church like that. There is an immense difference between being vaguely interested in religion and knowing the living God; between exploring analytically the creeds which men have fashioned and the forms of worship they have devised, and being arrested by the glory of the Lord and being gripped by a direct sense of the unseen. It is one thing to accept an orthodox theology, and to be attached, more or less, to organized religion: it is a totally different thing to hear the voice that cries from heaven, "Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak with thee!"

It is here, declares Jeremiah, that we can discern God's deliberate intention in the new covenant of His appointing. No more secondhand religion; no more borrowed theology; no more dull, unkindled churches which are merely efficient, competent machines, dealing with reality at a distance, and sending earnest seekers away with an aching, disappointed sense that something vital is lacking; but everywhere—that thrilling sense of immediacy, that directness of touch, that sureness of vision, that spiritual drive and momentum which come when man and God authentically meet, and heart can speak with heart. "No man shall teach his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know me, from the least of them to the greatest."

Is there anything that would more vitally affect the new chapter of history which will begin on the day (God grant it be not too remote) when "the war drums throb no longer and the battle flags are furled," anything that would more decisively heal and restore this battered earth than the rekindling of such a faith and the resurgence of religious passion? The truth is that what is required now is not doctrinal reaffirmation nor ecclesiastical reconstruction. It is spiritual resurrection. It is the creating of life.

This sets the Church its primary task. What is the Church, in the mind of God, intended to be? A social conscience, a guardian and depository of true doctrine, a fellowship of reconciliation—all this, certainly. But nothing about a church—no culture and enlightenment, no liturgical correctness and exactitude, no assiduous attention to the machinery of good works—will justify its existence, unless it is a place where men can come quite sure that their hungry hearts will find the living bread.

Some of us have a dream of the Church of the future. We see a church emerging, far less concerned with its denominational differences, and far more thrilled by its essential unity in Christ; not fettered by the

shackles of use and wont, nor ruled and tyrannized by its own traditional methods, but experimenting with daring, initiative and originality for the glory of the Lord; not ministering only to its own members, but obedient to the New Testament injunction, "Let us go unto Him without the camp," thrusting God on all manner and conditions of men and glorying in His grace.

But the crucial problem still remains. How are this inwardness and this immediacy to be achieved? How is God to storm and capture the central stronghold of the heart? Is it not too late? Must it not be said, in view of the ruthless and devastating despotism of the powers of evil, that God is too late with His strategy? How can there be deliverance from the bondage of sin's corruption? How shall God act to eradicate the tragic bias from man's will and to capture his stubborn heart?

To this question Jeremiah has the answer. This is the third feature of the new covenant which he specifically underlines. God will make His way with men *by forgiveness*. That was to be the method. "I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more." That would win them. And it did. To the end of time it will go on doing it.

What is it that closes the gap of alienation between the Holy God and sinful man? It is not any supreme effort on man's part; it is a great forgiving initiative on God's part. The gap is closed from God's side of it, and forgiveness is the bridge.

This is a matter in which we may consult our own experience. Many a man would affirm that whereas the thunders of Sinai had no effect save to harden him in his stubbornness and to stiffen him in his rebellion, God's unmerited forgiveness, the divine, amazing act of reconciliation and welcome, besieged his obdurate heart, got under his defenses, and finally broke every barrier down. I may defy the thunders and resist the threats; but to be forgiven utterly when I know the miserable things that I have done, to be trusted as a child of God and a well-loved friend when I do not deserve the status of a hireling, to see love bridging the ultimate gulf at the cost of crucifixion, that brings me to God's feet. "This cup is the new covenant in my blood." That is how Christ conquers.

Let no one suppose that this answer—the Christian answer to man's desperate dilemma—is just archaic language, doctrinal theorizing, vague and rhetorical and irrelevant. In point of fact, it is the most terrific thrust of absolutely shattering realism which this world has ever seen.

Words stagger before the mystery of the Cross; but that is because the Cross itself is the eternal Word, dynamic and explosive, supercharged with the energies of grace. It is more than a Word—it is the supreme deed, God's deed, the dramatic break-through of the world beyond into this world of time and history. And when I survey the wondrous Cross, I am witnessing the whole forbidding array of man's once invincible foes—fear, frustration, sin, corruption, death—challenged at the very seat and center of their power. I am seeing the dark principalities and powers (as Saint Paul expressed it) “made a show of openly, triumphed over,” trampled underfoot in the very moment when the whole might of evil was concentrated for the supreme decisive stroke. That is why the answer of the Cross succeeds where every other answer fails. I am seeing the victory of God.

Therefore when we say that the dark demonic powers which are leaving their dreadful trail of devastation across the world today are ultimately less powerful than Jesus, we really mean it. We mean it just as the early disciples meant it when they declared that Christ had raided the realm of Satan and broken the fast-bound chains of hell. And if there are professing Christians today who do not see the relevance of the gospel to the desperate situation of this tortured world, it can only be because it is some dim Galilean memory that they are worshipping, some martyr mystic whom they revere. If that is the Christian religion, it certainly is irrelevant. But the good news is not that. It is this, “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” It is Christ in action, victor over death, vanquisher of the demons, going forth conquering and to conquer.

But let it not be forgotten that a covenant implies a dual relationship. God's mighty deed for man, in the blood of the everlasting covenant, must elicit man's vow to God, in the dedication of life. “I will take the cup of salvation. I will pay my vows unto the Lord now in the presence of all His people.”

Should Missions Go On?

BASIL MATHEWS

I

IN THE fiercest weeks of the "blitz" attempt to break the spirit of Britain, a church in Glasgow was preparing for a "social" gathering, the proceeds of which were to be sent to the foreign missions board supported by that church. Three nights before that "social" was planned to take place, bombing airplanes smashed the church. Nothing remained save a chaotic rubble of stone, brick and girders.

Did the church write the event off as cancelled? The event—yes; the goal—no! The undaunted pastor swiftly wrote and multigraphed a letter to every member of his "flock." In that letter he showed that every bomb aimed at the supremacy of spiritual and moral values revealed with almost blinding clearness that the one sure hope of just and durable peace lay in the world-wide rule of the mind that was in Christ Jesus. The spiritual descendants of John Knox were not going to be diverted from that world goal by the blows of a pagan dictator! In fact, his blows intensified the need for the universal spread of the gospel.

The church building was destroyed. The gathering could not be held. But—the pastor asked—would not each church member send to him for the world mission of Christianity the equivalent of what he or she would have contributed at the "social," including—note the Scottish touch—his round-trip carfare! As a result the mission board headquarters was startled to receive from that bombed church just *twice as much money* as the gathering had been expected to produce.

That event dramatizes the issue that calls for decision and action now that the American people are fully involved in a war that has become planetary in scope and "totalitarian" in its demands upon all. Is the world mission of Christianity a luxury to be sidetracked "for the duration"? Or do we see in it an absolute priority because we know that the one assured power for achieving and sustaining harmonious world order lies in Christ's transforming power through His world-wide community?

Do we or do we not believe that Jesus Christ really did initiate a

process in history that cannot find fulfillment short of world community? Do we or do we not believe that that supreme goal is central to His purpose and, therefore, to the will of God? If we do not so believe, we shall be driven to ask for what then did the Son of God die if not to reconcile the world to the Father of us all? But if we do so believe, then we must surely redouble our enthusiastic service in the supreme hour when that Christian meaning of life is challenged as never before.

The devotees of the modern materialistic religions of Naziism, Fascism and Marxism spend millions of dollars on missionary propaganda. Millions are ready to die in obedience to their leaders in these faiths. We can only triumph over a false missionary faith with a true faith. Should not Christians spend their lives, as well as their resources of money, in proclaiming the Kingdom of God? If millions read the program of Hitler in *Mein Kampf*, Christians everywhere must brace themselves for carrying out the revolutionary program of God by discovering it more fully every day in the Bible.

What are our aims as Christians? Our goal is a community where the free spirit of men of all races, classes and faiths, expresses itself in creative fellowship; an industrial order where the economic basis of democracy is widened; the rule of justice and good faith in national and international affairs; and the welfare and development of backward peoples to freedom as the central task of colonial government. Is there any power that can achieve them at the end of this war?

We have for the most part taken it for granted that justice and freedom and the spirit of co-operation—which are foundations of peace—are valid in their own right. They are not. Hitler by defying and denying them has driven us to ask what is their true foundation. Their foundation is in ultimate Reality. God alone is their source. Hitler proclaims the opposite principles. He says that one race, being on a higher plane, has the right to despotic domination over other peoples. He maintains that the nation-state and its leader have absolute right over the individual and his conscience, and the right to override justice and to tear up treaties with other states. He proclaims that as a creed. That creed has been the driving force of his program. In a passionate missionary enterprise he declares it to the world by radio, by a controlled press, by the authoritative scripture of *Mein Kampf*, and through the voices of tens of thousands of obedient schoolteachers and university pro-

fessors. Caesar is God. The men who now control the policy and action of Japan have developed its ancient nature worship of Shinto and the myth of the divine origin of the Emperor into a similar mystical Caesarism. We can only win justice and freedom if we proclaim to all the world and live by the truth that God is, that He is the One ultimate source of justice, and the Father of men of all races.

We can make a wider application of what Nicholas Berdyaev has wisely said: "The only thing to pit against integral communism, materialistic communism, is integral Christianity; not rhetorical, tattered, decadent Christianity, but renascent Christianity, working out its eternal truth toward consistent life, consistent culture, consistent social service." We can eclipse Hitler's appeal to the Aryan blood and the Nordic race with the world-wide brotherhood of Christ's table, to whom he says: "This is my body; this is my blood."

Victory even by the anti-Axis forces will simply leave chaos unless during the war we do our utmost to lay the spiritual and moral foundations of a new order. War at best does the work of a house-wrecker. The Christian Church throughout the world has to build that city of peace, the plans of which are in the heart of the Divine Architect.

II

Evil rampant is not evil triumphant. If we lift up our gaze to the Kingdom of God, these temporal horrors will be seen in their true perspective. I found in the London blackout, when walking those dark streets, that, because of the blackness, I could for the first time in my life see the polestar from a city street. So the blackness of war may open to our blinded sight the eternal light of God, and His guiding star may become clear to eyes too long dazzled by man-made illumination.

For Christ's community to falter or shelter itself behind entrenchments at this time would be tragic. When we say, "With God all things are possible," we do not mean that He, reigning above the battle, can and will pull us out of this mess without our making any effort. Surely it means that we shall discover that, when our will is His and when we work *with* God, all things *are* possible. His will is what it always has been: that we obey the command of our leader, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel." There stands Christ's clear command. To obey it in time of war is to lay the foundation of peace. But even if that

were not so, the fact that this is His will and that we are His disciples, makes the proclaiming of His good news to all the world our supreme duty.

All the time God's way is, however painfully and slowly, to win man to Himself out of his own ways. If we look across the world we see that He has already won to Himself peoples of all races. The growth of the Church in the present century is greater than in any similar length of time in Christian history. In both China and Japan the number of communicants has multiplied fivefold in this century and has doubled in the the past ten years. In Negro Africa the number of communicants has doubled in the last thirteen years. In India the number has trebled in the present century and doubled in the last ten years. In the Philippine Islands, where the Church scarcely existed at the beginning of the century, the communicants now number nearly two hundred thousand. In Latin America communicants have increased sevenfold in this century and trebled in the past thirteen years.¹

The fact that war has come upon the world does not weaken the authority of the teaching of Christ and His way of life, any more than did the fact that, after three years of teaching, He was broken upon the Cross. He went through that agony of death to rise again to new life; and so may the Church that is His Body. The fact of war makes it more vital than ever to harness our best energies to the service of our Lord for the world growth of His community.

Our true response to ultimate Reality, as shown in and through Jesus Christ, is to say "Our Father," and, as Father, God has "made of one blood all nations of men." To put this into practice we must have a world community of Christians, each one committed decisively in his innermost heart to that discipleship. For the unregenerate heart, however idealistic, falters and fails before the revolutionary task of transforming human relations. And that world Church can only come into being through a missionary faith—the apostolic urgency of gladly witnessing to the saving power that makes the man who is in Christ literally a new creation.

That missionary faith, expressed in sacrificial living, is the only realistic foundation for world peace. For in it, and in it alone, are the bases of community, not within one race or one country, but between

¹The numbers given in this paragraph are for communicants of the non-Roman churches only. If we take the total of those who have received baptism the number is, of course, considerably larger.

men of all races. The message is simple. Sons of one Father, we live by a common faith; we share a common loyalty. He created us. He redeems us. In Him we are one, in spite of terribly bitter differences. Our countries may be divided by war. Antagonisms may divide our races. Yet our fellowship is in Him unbreakable.

The sin of man—in which we are all bound up—has led us into the catastrophe of this war. The fact that man cannot go on violating God's will without disaster is really part of His mercy. If it were not so, goodness would have no meaning. Confessing our share in the sin that has brought us to this pass, we repent our forgetfulness of the Father; our failure to pray and work for the whole brotherhood; our prejudice, fear, bitterness, pride, coldness and greed.

The great objective of this Christian world missionary campaign includes all our better aims in the present conflict. The weapon of war, however, cannot heal the wounds of the world. It cannot reconcile the warring members of the human family. War may stop injustice, but at a terrible price, often creating new problems afterwards. Christian missions create a new world, providing communities in each country who, in increasing co-operation in thought, prayer, planning and action, will become the living nucleus of world community after the war—nations and races really reconciled in the Christian family.

III

This, then is supremely the time to assert the world mission of the Christian Church by word and deed. In the years before the war the Church throughout the world was moving toward a deeper world unity than ever before. In the world conferences of Oxford and Edinburgh in 1937, leaders from many nations came into a unique fellowship of thought and prayer, as they brought the totalitarian creed under the critical scrutiny of the Christian conception of Church, community and state. At Tambaram, Madras, in 1938, already under the shadow of world crisis, the older churches of the West and the younger churches of Asia and Africa found a fresh unity of purpose as they grappled with the task of world conquest for Christ. Then in 1939 representatives of the world's Christian youth at Amsterdam fused these new visions and practical projects into a fresh program.

Some may feel, now that war has come upon us, "what a terrible

waste these meetings were"! The precise contrary, of course, is true. Should we not be thankful that in the providence of God we were led to have these world conferences while it was still possible to meet together? The findings of the meeting of the International Missionary Council at Madras, for instance, are seen to have an even deeper relevance when they are reread in the light of the present situation. For never in the nearly two thousand years of Christian history has the Church looked so fully as it did at Madras at its world responsibility and opportunity, and at all sides of the life of man in the light of Christian revelation.

The missionary movement, under God, is bringing into being the universal Church. Can we be disloyal to the world-wide fellowship to which we belong? Can we remember the faces of our friends of our own and other races overseas, and fail to give them in this dark hour full backing and support? Cannot the Christian community, withstanding the strain of war, and rejoicing in differences of culture, discover the depth and reality of the faith uniting us all in one family?

We can ask for no more moving and eloquent witness to the power of the Christian community to sustain its universal character across the world than the wonderful, creative service during the war to what are now called the "orphaned" missions. Hitler's conquests in Europe cut off over fourteen hundred missionaries in Asia, Africa, the Netherlands Indies and elsewhere from their home bases in Germany, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France and Finland. In the mission fields in which they work are hospitals, colleges, schools, churches and their healing, teaching and preaching staffs and equipment whose support is still far beyond the capacity of the Asiatic and African Christians—more than a million in all—linked to those missions in those European Nazi-dominated lands. No less than one hundred and twelve missions were thus separated from their parent churches in Europe.

Financial support and in some cases fresh missionaries have been sent to these mission areas. The gifts have come from the United States, Canada, Great Britain, Sweden, South Africa, Australia, India, China, Syria and other lands. No discrimination has been made on national or creedal grounds. The work of gathering these funds, assessing the needs, and getting the supplies to the fields has been organized through the International Missionary Council. Although missionaries and other workers suffer severe privation no mission has been abandoned or suspended.

The front line of the Church in its world-wide missionary advance is unbroken.

Challenge and stimulus for western Christians come to us also in the witness of the Chinese Church in time of war. We are braced by the serenity of Chinese Christians, by the tenacity of their Christian faith amid the physical agony and strain of invasion and recurrent air raids, by their vigor and practical initiative, by their consistent prayer for the Japanese people, by the resource and ingenuity that they display in adapting life to conditions that would seem impossible. We can take warning also from the subtle and deadly temptations which assail the Japanese Church, as always among a dominant imperialist people. Many Japanese Christians have sought, in penitence, a practical path of reconciliation with their Chinese fellow Christians. There is virtue in these younger churches; and that virtue is a strong encouragement to the churches in the warring countries of the West.

Even before the Japanese government forced war upon the United States, the Church in Japan had been obliged by its rulers to cease to receive support for any part of its work from western sources. War itself, however, cannot stop the prayers of American and Japanese Christians for each other. Nor can war sever either of these two branches from Christ, the Vine, in whom they have their enduring oneness.

Supreme among all Christian activities, the missionary enterprise stands firmly today in wartime for the free fellowship of nation with nation, and the offering of the gospel to the ends of the earth. Thousands of men and women of many races in missionary schools and colleges are carrying to hundreds of thousands of children the teaching of the Prince of Peace, and are leading them toward His discipleship. Multitudes all over Asia and across Africa are, in the wards of mission hospitals and dispensaries, receiving healing at the hands of the Great Physician. The treachery involved in letting them down is unthinkable. We must not break this sublime team spirit where white and nonwhite, pupil and teacher, missionary and national of different lands all work together to build up the Body in love. The daughter churches, to whom, under God, we have given birth, the fast-growing churches of adolescent age, the veteran churches, all alike require the fellowship of the universal Church, so that we may together maintain perspective, keep our balance, prepare for a just peace and a lasting reconciliation. It is in Christian fellowship

with men and women of other lands that together we shall be found of God and together go forward with quietness and confidence in the teeth of disaster, to share in God's world victory.

That Christian community is now rooted in the soil everywhere. And the Christ who said, in face of the Cross, "Be of good cheer, I have overcome the world," is with His world fellowship in their inner weakness and in face of the menace from without.

It follows, then, in actual practice that the man who says, "I am so preoccupied with the war that I can give no time or money or interest to the support of the missionary enterprise," is turning his back on a central way of bringing great good out of this titanic evil. For, as a non-Christian said recently to a Christian friend in South India, "There is in Christianity a doctrine which I believe is peculiar to it, and which I have not found in the five religions: the doctrine that God can take what is bad and bring good out of it."

We remember what we owe to the vision and courage of our missionary fathers. The modern missionary movement began, not in time of peace but when, as now, the war clouds had gathered over Europe. Our fathers have handed on to us this torch. We must keep it burning with even greater devotion because these days are dark. The young churches of Asia and Africa are still largely dependent upon us for that comradeship and sustenance which will help them to stand and grow in a hostile world. We dare not fail them.

IV

What then shall we do? Obstacles face us on every hand. But in the light of our devotion to Christ and His Kingdom every stumbling block can be made into a steppingstone. The Chinese word for "crisis" is, we are told, made up of two symbols—"danger-opportunity." Anyone can see the danger: the hallmark of leadership is to see and seize the opportunity. There lies the difference between defeat and victory.

The adventure of that Christian Church in Glasgow with which we began, is a dramatic example of making the "danger" in "crisis" become the "opportunity." But that incident is not isolated. Indeed so general has been the determination of Christians in Britain to carry forward the campaigns of the Kingdom of God that the first year of war saw greater total contributions to the missionary enterprise than the year before the

war. This sustained Christian loyalty becomes all the more eloquent when we recall that over a thousand of their churches have been entirely destroyed and that such serious damage has been done to over two thousand other churches that they cannot be used; that church members have, through evacuation, service in army, navy, air force, home guard, nursing and so on, been scattered in all directions, and that practically all Sunday schools have vanished from the industrial cities with the evacuated children.

The ordeal of total war has now come upon the American people. Before the end comes with victory, sacrifice will have been demanded of all. Of all countries now involved in the World War, the United States has the greatest human and material resources and her citizens are likely to suffer less dislocation and tragic disruption than any other that is at war. It is inconceivable that American Christians can fail their Lord or their fellow sufferers across the world in this supreme crisis, this Armageddon of spiritual and moral forces. The Cross must hold the field and Christ's community grow in range and strength and unity.

If we look for opportunities we shall find and seize them, whatever our circumstances. "One loving heart sets another on fire." In the first century Christianity spread because every disciple was a missionary, a witness. Wherever he went, traveling the Roman roads or going about his business in the cities of Asia Minor, he spoke naturally to his fellow travelers and neighbors about the Christ whom he worshiped. Before Augustine and his missionaries reached Kent, Roman soldiers had witnessed to Christ among the people of Britain. Today, many of Christ's followers in the United States of America are far from home in office and factory and camp, in warden's post and hospital, in naval depots, on the sea and at the fighting fronts. Will it be said of us that we also witnessed for our Master in this our day of opportunity?

The universal community of the Prince of Peace will grow even in wartime if each of us prays each day that God's will may be done by us in this calamity, and by Him through it; if, every day, in the light of this, we try to discover what we can do to advance His Kingdom; and if, having thus resolved, we do it regardless of the cost. We are now in the midst of tragedy; but if we, who are of those who look for His appearing pray and think and work together at this time, we may have the assurance, of the ultimate world triumph of His Kingdom.

Law and Grace

WALTER M. HORTON

L"AW" is the word that best summarizes the Old Testament. "Grace" is the word that best summarizes the New Testament. "For the law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John 1:17).

Rightly related, law and grace express the whole Christian revelation. Wrongly related, they put Christianity out of focus, and destroy its effective impact upon the world. They are not easy to relate, since they are in some respects contradictory opposites; yet to accept one and reject the other is to do fatal damage to both. Let us begin with the contradiction between them—a contradiction which Christians are bound to resolve in favor of grace—and then let us consider how, notwithstanding the contradiction, law is a necessary element in the working of the God of grace, and a necessary element in the Christian ethical ideal.

I. THE CONTRADICTION OF LAW AND GRACE

As *ways of salvation*, law and grace are in flat contradiction. To believe, with Paul and Luther and all the great evangelists, in salvation by grace, means to abandon hope of moral righteousness or "salvation by character." It means that no amount of moral effort, however heroic, is sufficient to make peace between God and man. It is impossible to be good enough, by trying, to be blameless in the sight of the divine Judge. Even where the divine Will and the divine Law are expressly revealed—given by angels, as the Jews believed the Decalogue was given to Moses—that is by itself more a cause for despair than for rejoicing. To see what is right clearly and unmistakably, and know at the same time, inexorably, that it is too much for us—that is the tragic situation in which Paul and Luther have once for all shown us that we stand.

If the average Christian does not take things so tragically it is because he does not yet know the majesty of God's Law, and the secret of his own heart. He is pretty well satisfied with his ability to "be good," because he has not realized what the divine Goodness requires. He is content to take the road by the town of Morality, with Legality and Civility as his official guides, because he has not seen what Bunyan's Pilgrim saw when he came opposite Mount Sinai: how threateningly that

mountain overhangs the road, and how its volcanic fires scorch and terrify those who walk that way. Some day he will see and know, when some crisis opens his eyes to his real position; then he will understand the meaning of that burden on Christian's back from which only God's grace, God's costly forgiveness freely bestowed in the Cross of Christ could deliver him. "By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God, not of works, lest any man should boast" (Ephesians 2:8-9).

The *ethical disposition* of the man who lives under grace is utterly different from that of the man who lives under law. The legalist is inclined to be censorious of others, for he clearly sees their shortcomings by the "law in his mind," whereas his own shortcomings are concealed from him by much the same fault of perspective that makes him unable to see the features of his own face—except by reflection. Let others reflect adversely upon his behavior, and he rushes gallantly to his own defense—to save his face. The man under grace is more apt to be hard on himself and "gracious" to those who go wrong. He has been forgiven, therefore he must be forgiving or show rank ingratitude. He knows he is not righteous, therefore he can accept criticism without resentment and view the sins of others without getting puffed up with self-important indignation. "There, but for the grace of God, go I," he says to himself in the presence of the most degraded forms of vice. If his rights are trampled upon, he does not hate his persecutors or cease to do them good when he sees the opportunity; for his Lord, the one who has given him back his lost soul and put hope in his heart, was likewise "despised and rejected of men," and nevertheless did not cease to do good to His persecutors. Had his Lord not been persistently gracious with *him* while he was still foolishly trying to justify himself, what hope would there be for him now? After being the object of such gracious patience, must he not now exercise the same patience toward others? When God in Christ has borne hardship to redeem him, and loved him while he was yet in sin, must he not bear hardship to befriend others, whether they respond or whether they refuse to respond?

2. THE KINSHIP OF LAW AND GRACE

If the way and the disposition of the true Christian are thus utterly opposed to legalism, does it not follow that Christianity is a kind of

anarchism, despising all law, all moral rules, all social conventions, all government or guidance of any sort save the inward guidance of a grateful and loving heart? In their more unguarded moments, the great apostles of God's grace have sometimes talked like anarchists. "If ye be led of the Spirit," said Paul, "ye are not under the law" (Galatians 5:16). "Love God and do as you please," said Augustine. "Sin lustily," cried Luther to a poor wretch overburdened with a sense of guilt. But such utterances are quite misleading when wrenched from their context. Sholem Asch is right: Paul "threw the law out of the front door and smuggled it in again by the back door"; for while he released his Gentile converts from the yoke of the Jewish law, he sternly opposed their lapses into license; and in his letters to them he laid down the law like a new Moses, redefining all the fundamental duties of life in the light of the supreme law of love. Every great Christian thinker has done something similar for his own age, redefining the practical implications of the grace-inspired, Spirit-led life in terms of a code of conduct relative to the peculiar needs and pressing problems of the time. So Augustine taught his fellow Christians to be law-abiding citizens of the Earthly City, the Christianized Roman Empire, while at the same time holding their final citizenship in the City of God, where no law is needed. And Luther has been more often and more justly criticized for ascribing too much divine authority to earthly potentates and their laws, than for being an anarchist—which he plainly and patently wasn't.

The truth is that in spite of their radical opposition as ways of salvation and moral dispositions, law and grace are mysteriously akin. "Love is the fulfilling of the law"—not its destruction. Between the religion of Torah at its best and the religion of Christ at its best, there is not so great a gulf as at first appears. I once had a conversation with a Jewish rabbi who agreed with me on the following propositions; that the "justice" of which the Old Testament speaks is a justice administered with love and mercy, and the "love" or "grace" of which the New Testament speaks is firmly opposed to injustice; but that when Judaism degenerates, it lapses into a cold, proud legalism, whereas Christianity, when it decays, softens into a putrescent mush of sentimentality. Grace requires law to provide a stable order within which it can do its silent, slow, transforming work; and grace requires law for its own effectual embodiment in the corporate life of mankind.

3. LAW AND GRACE IN GOD'S CHARACTER

Both law and grace are grounded in the character of God. The Old Testament revelation of God is mainly summed up in the declaration that while the Lord is "long-suffering and of great mercy," He is inexorably just, "by no means clearing the guilty, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation" (Numbers 14:18). This declaration has never been repealed; all the terrible details of the Day of the Lord that is now upon us bear witness to its truth. If God's justice were less certain, if His periodic threats to "have the law on us" for our sins were not in earnest, then it is mournfully probable that we should never think of beseeching Him to grant us grace! It is the central teaching of the New Testament that grace is available to the repentant sinner, that divine grace is seeking the sinner, suffering for him, dying for him, before he thinks of asking for grace; yet it remains unalterably true that to the unrepentant sinner the God of grace behaves like a God of wrath. He who will not kneel before the Cross is driven to his knees by the thunderbolts of Sinai. Praise be to the divine mercy that it is so!

Luther made a memorable attempt to grasp these two aspects of the character of God in their relationship, when he called the wrath of the God of Law, "God's alien work," and the forgiving love of the God of Grace, "God's own proper work." That is to say, in His grace God exhibits His real nature and real intention, whereas in His capacity as lawgiver and judge, God does that which is "necessary for the sake of love," but necessary only because man's stubbornness and rebellion force upon man's Creator a stern repressive attitude which does not reveal the deep center of the divine nature. The kingdom of law, to which all earthly governments belong, is for Luther part of the Kingdom of God, but it is the "kingdom of his left hand" wherewith He punishes crime, beats off destructive inroads of the Turks and keeps order for the sake of His elect; whereas the kingdom of grace, to which these saints belong, is God's "right kingdom which He governs Himself," where there is "no father and mother, emperor and king, hangman and police." (See Paul Tillich's article on "Love's Strange Work," in *The Protestant* for December-January, 1942, pp. 70-75.)

Two things need to be made clear, if this idea of a double work of God is not to lead us into moral confusion. One is that human political

life is never a pure expression of God's justice, much less of His grace. When we speak of a political event—say a war or a revolution—as a “judgment of God,” we do not mean that God's “left hand” designs it in heaven, and then hurls it bodily down upon earth like a thunderbolt. Every such event is partly a work of man, partly a work of God, and partly a work of the devil. God's left-handed work, as lawgiver and judge, is to maintain a compensatory balance in the midst of human folly and Satanic cruelty, making evil work its own undoing, and redound to the general good in spite of itself. But meanwhile the same God, with His gracious “right hand,” is working remedially, constructively in the same cruel chaos to save us from His own judgment and remake us inwardly in the image of His Son. Here is a second ambiguity that needs to be cleared up. The working of God's left hand of justice, while different from that of His right hand of grace, must not be so *incompatible* with grace that the two hands cannot collaborate. If grace is truly the heart of God's nature, no fundamentally cruel laws and actions can ever be sanctioned in His name. Only those forms of justice can be brought within the scheme of divine providence which (with due allowance for the fact that God “moves in a mysterious way”) can be regarded as appropriate means for the accomplishment of gracious ends.

4. LAW AND GRACE IN CHRISTIAN ETHICS

The fundamental maxim of Christian ethics is, *Treat one another as God in Christ has treated you*. In the Cross of Christ—together with what leads up to it and flows from it—God has freely offered His gracious forgiveness and His transforming power to all, no matter how far they may have wandered from the path of obedience to His commandments. Christians likewise must be ready to forgive *anybody* and help *anybody*—even if he be their worse enemy, or the most degraded wretch imaginable—without waiting for him to ask for forgiveness, and without inquiring whether he deserves to be helped. But the same Cross which is an emblem of salvation to the repentant is an emblem of condemnation to the unrepentant. Whoever will not stand on the side of the Crucified, under the sign of God's grace, stands with the crucifiers, under the unrepealed law of Sinai, which decrees that those who rebel against God and His anointed shall feel the rod of His anger, and meet with defeat after defeat until they “kiss the rod.” It is a part of the duty of Christians

—even as members of the Church, the organ of God's grace—to exercise discipline against those who would presume upon the divine mercy and bring disgrace upon the Christian community by their conduct. It is likewise their duty as citizens of the State (the more or less imperfect instrument of God's law) to support the public authorities in their endeavor to keep down crime and to maintain order and justice between contending group interests.

For many reasons Christians engage in these disciplinary activities with more reluctance than other people. They hope to convert the evil-doer, which is far better than merely restraining him by law; and they are constantly saying to themselves, "Judge not, that ye be not judged, for with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged"—that is to say, they are humbly aware of their own guilt, and their unworthiness to represent the justice of God. But if they leave the administration of justice wholly to non-Christians, they run the risk of encouraging that very harshness and cruelty of judgment which they deplore. So it may be consistent with the calling of some Christians to serve in law courts, or police forces, or armies, striving to make the necessary work of the administration of secular justice or the maintenance of public order at least *consistent* with grace, and at best even a *means* of grace. Other Christians in order to clear their approach to men from all trace of compulsion that might alienate evil-doers and hinder the work of grace, must abstain from all connection with the "hand of the law"; but this their special calling does not destroy their responsibility to uphold the law, nor their fellowship with Christians whose specific calling enrolls them among the agents of compulsion.

In time of peace there is no tension between these two groups of Christians; in time of war, tragically, there must be, because war forces us to choose between two alternatives: to join in our nation's military effort, which professes to be in the interest of world order, but inevitably works much barbarous injustice and may lead us all down to chaos owing to the uncontrollable character of the forces it invokes; or, refusing to participate in war and confining our efforts to the works of grace, to risk swinging the balance in favor of forces even more cruel and unprincipled than those from which we shrink in horror. The works of grace must be maintained in time of war, or there is no hope for a better order afterward; but each Christian should choose his "branch of the service" with full understanding that he has a responsibility *both* to uphold law and

justice *and* to make grace abound. Unless *both* ends are sought by the whole Christian movement, neither is likely to be attained.

Emil Brunner has distinguished three senses in which the Christian remains under the law, even after meeting with God's free grace and abandoning all hope of legal righteousness; (1) As a citizen, he is in duty bound to obey and uphold the law of his country, just because it is the law of his country, unless and until it becomes his duty to revolt against an evil law in the name of God. (2) As one who is still a sinner, though in process of being "saved by grace," he must remind himself frequently of the threats and promises of the Old Testament, which have never been repealed—for sinners. Though the Old Testament law does not include, for Christians, the detailed provisions of the Jewish Torah, it does include the gist of the moral law enunciated by the prophets and accepted by the rabbis as the basis of their legal system. (3) As one under grace, and dependent on grace for his salvation, the Christian still needs the instruction of Christ's "new law of liberty" to point the goal toward which the Spirit is inwardly impelling him to move. No longer as a master to a slave, but as a father to a son, whom he is instructing in his own infinitely difficult master craft, God speaks an essential word in the Sermon on the Mount and in the supreme commandment of love. (Brunner, *The Divine Imperative*, Chapter XIV.)

In this threefold distinction Brunner excellently suggests both the contradiction and the kinship between the way of law and the way of grace. Civil justice is very remote from the realm of grace; moral justice is closer to it, but by itself breeds legalistic pride; the commandment of love is grace itself moving out to bless the world. If the three forms of law are kept in living connection with one another, so that they supplement and correct one another, there is no final contradiction between law and grace; for as Brunner says, "the law which guides is the same as the civil law radically interpreted from the point of view of love, just as the civil law can only exercise its function of maintaining order, and its pedagogical function, because at the same time it is connected with the commandment of love. Thus the law exercises us at the same time in discipline, humility and joyful childlike obedience." (p. 151.) All inhumane laws and all oppressive political regimes are of course condemned by this test, and must be opposed by Christians.

Eschatology for Today

HUGH THOMSON KERR, JR.

ESCHATOLOGY in one of those technical theological terms which for many today conveys little if any meaning. Literally it means the study of the last things, but more specifically it stands for all those questions about death, immortality, heaven and hell, judgment, the end of the world, etc., which always have occupied the minds of serious-thinking people. It is, as such, a comprehensive word and, since there is no simpler equivalent, it serves a useful and necessary end.

In the history of the Christian tradition there have been times when interest in eschatology was one of the outstanding characteristics of faith and life. This was certainly so in the Early Church when the Christians, as T. R. Glover has put it, outthought, outlived and outdied the pagan world.¹ It was so during the Reformation when Luther could speak of death as the most welcome event in life, and Calvin wrote, "With whatever kind of tribulation we may be afflicted, we should always keep this end in view—to habituate ourselves to a contempt of the present life, that we may thereby be excited to meditation on that which is to come."² This too was one of the characteristics of the early Puritans who taught their children to pray at bedtime: "Now I lay me down to sleep, I pray the Lord my soul to keep; If I should die before I wake, I pray the Lord my soul to take." Perhaps it would be true to say that when the witness of the Church was strongest, belief in the future was one of the cardinal convictions of believing men. And by the same token it would be true to say that when interest in eschatology wanes, the vitality of the Christian message is thereby weakened. This is the view of a recent writer who points out that the "period of serious Church decline coincides with the greatest neglect of eschatology."³ And Professor John Baillie, of Edinburgh, in his book, *And the Life Everlasting* (p. 4), says by way of explaining the reason for writing the book that, "It is impossible to disguise the fact that in our own time we are confronted with a certain failure of belief in regard to eternal life. . . . The new

¹ *The Jesus of History*, p. 200.

² *Institutes*, III. 9. 1.

³ D. R. Davies, *On to Orthodoxy*, p. 142.

mood of which I am speaking," he says, "may be most summarily described as a revolt against the other-worldliness of the traditional outlook." Signs of this shift are not hard to find. It may be, as Baillie suggests, that the reaction was born during the Renaissance and received tremendous impetus from the rapid growth of science. Here, for instance, is Schleiermacher saying, "In every moment to be eternal—this is the true immortality of religion." It is not at all uncommon to find men and women, and particularly young people, go so far as to say, "I am not interested in immortality, I have no wish to live forever." And even among those who might be expected to be most vocal in positive affirmations, namely the Christian ministry, there has been a decided falling off of what we might call eschatological preaching. In a popular monthly survey of American preaching, there is scarcely ever a sermon on immortality or the future except during the Easter season and even then the sermons are not characterized by strength of conviction but by a hesitant and apologetic approach. D. R. Davies in his *On to Orthodoxy* feels strongly that this modern lack of faith is "a direct consequence of Christian liberalism." "Assume," he says, "the perfectibility of human nature, and in effect you make History a self-sufficient, closed system. Make History a closed system, then death and immortality lose their significance. And so we have lived to tolerate the utterance of the most incredible drivel, the most puerile rubbish by Christian Liberalism about eschatology—such trash, for example, as the 'immortality of the race'; 'the immortality of influence,' etc., etc." (p. 142.)

Whatever may be the causes for a falling off of interest in eschatological problems, there would seem to be good reason to believe that gradually and with growing intensity we are witnessing in our own day a revival of interest in what is known as eschatology. Books on the subject seem to be multiplying, Baillie's *And the Life Everlasting* might be regarded as a turning point. Closely connected too are the many books on the meaning of history from the pens of men like Berdyaev, Tillich, Piper, etc. "Heilsgeschichte" (not a very happy word on the English tongue) has become current coin in the contemporaneous theological vocabulary. Even the psychiatrists who once urged so strongly against the Puritan's bedtime prayer for its morbid occupation with death are beginning to change their tune. Here is Jung saying: "I am convinced that it is hygienic—if I may use the word—to discover in death a goal

toward which one can strive; and that shrinking away from it is something unhealthy and abnormal which robs the second half of life of its purpose. I consider, therefore, the religious teaching of a life hereafter consonant with the standpoint of psychic hygiene."⁴ And a recent popular study, H. C. Link's *The Rediscovery of Man*, suggests that belief in immortality is really the foundation of democracy. "The doctrine of immortality," we are told, "so frowned on by science, becomes in Christianity a dramatic expression of the supreme value of personality. The soul, not the political or economic system, lives on. The individual, not the state, has ultimate value. Therefore, the state exists for the individual, as in democracy, and not the individual for the state, as in Fascism and Communism." (p. 236.)

But more significant than these testimonies evidencing a revival of interest in eschatology, is the rise and development in our own time of a numberless host of small sects many of which are eschatological in character. The very rapidity with which they grow and expand as well as the influence they are having upon multitudes of people suggest that the established churches of our country are not meeting the eschatological needs of the people. Those who are not aware of this situation are apt to regard these groups as more laughable than laudable and dismiss them with a gesture. But they deserve more serious attention simply because they minister to an estimated fifteen million people. There has been something about America which has made such a growth possible. A recent study of the subject by V. F. Calverton, *Where Angels Dared to Tread*, takes the rather obvious but significant position that "From every civilized part of the earth men have come to America in search of a better life," and that many who came were religious utopians intent upon living as the early Apostles lived, in community, peace and high expectancy. Some of the names of these groups are well known, for example, the Mormons, Ephrata Colony, the Shakers, Father Divine, etc., and some of them are still going strong. And in very recent years the same impulse which led to the establishment of these more or less well-known groups has also been at work in the formation of countless other religious sects not so well known but of equal importance. Elmer T. Clark, who has studied these smaller sects more minutely than anyone, estimates that they number between 250 to 300, exact figures being impossible since

⁴ *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, p. 129.

many of them rise and fall with the sun. Most people are ignorant of their existence, and it is always possible to entertain otherwise informed churchmen with the names of some of these sects. Have you heard, for instance, of the United Holy Church of America, or the Holiness Church of God Baptized in Jesus' Name, or the Apostolic Overcoming Holy Church of God? There is a church in New Orleans which has put all our attempts at denominational co-operation to shame bearing the imposing name, The Methodist Episcopal Baptist Church!

The outstanding characteristic of many of these churches is their eschatological point of view. For example, "The Purgatorial Society of Brooklyn has an ambitious program. The wife of Archbishop Barrow intends to be President of the United States; she will make a Jewish Rabbi of Kansas City the Vice-President and King of this world, her archepiscopal husband will be Speaker of the House of Representatives, their Majesties of England will be taken to Canada, the Pope of Rome will be brought to Washington as ruler of the Gentiles, Jesus will occupy Buckingham Palace in London, two United States Senators and a Judge will raise John the Baptist from the dead and a reign of everlasting peace will begin."⁵

There are many social and economic factors underlying such programs as this, but one important thing must not be overlooked—they minister to a large number of people who want to be sure about the future, who want to find strength for daily living in the assurance that there is a real Heaven "reserved for the hard-working poor, and a coming time when they shall change places with the exalted and the mighty." The weakness of the established churches at this point is apparent. They are not so sure about their interpretation of the future. They do not speak with any united voice, and they tend to avoid making precise or detailed plans for the future. But it is just here that the sects speak with consummate conviction. We may deplore the tactics and theology of these sects, but they indicate a growing dissatisfaction on the part of many with the teaching or lack of teaching in the established churches on eschatological questions. The situation is clear enough: if the churches do not speak plainly on immortality and the future, the small sects will. Therefore, one of the most important and urgent tasks of the Church

⁵ "The Psychology of the Small Sects," in the Annual Report, American Association of Theological Schools, 1940.

today is a concerted attempt to clarify and communicate the Christian Hope which faith in Jesus Christ implies. This, it may be added, is all the more necessary in these days of war and sudden death when eschatology ceases to be merely an academic or theological problem.

II

Just where the witness of the Church in this matter might be more vocal and illuminating, I shall try to suggest shortly, but at the outset it must be kept in mind that there are serious obstacles of one kind and another which confront any serious understanding of the Christian Hope.

For instance, it is obvious that here the experiential approach, so highly favored today, has little if any value. We can experience the love of God and the sin of man, we can know firsthand what forgiveness and providence mean, but we cannot experience immortality or resurrection or final judgment or cosmic consummation. And if those who put great store in the results of psychic research speak to the contrary and affirm the possibility of experiencing the future, we can only say that the verdict of psychic research seems to us hopelessly vague and inadequate. "I do not think it too much to say of these messages from beyond the tomb," says A. E. Taylor, "that if they are what they claim to be we can only hope that the unseen world like the seen has its homes for the feeble-minded and that it is with their inmates that our occultists are in communication."⁶

For others an almost insurmountable obstacle in dealing with the future lies in the ambiguous symbolism which is necessarily involved. The biblical data provide a case in point. The Revelation of Saint John, for example, in some particulars is beyond understanding for the simple reason that we are not always sure we know what the symbolism here refers to, nor are we sure that *we* understand what the *author* understood by such symbolism. There is, therefore, a double difficulty here. We are trying to speak of the unknown in symbolic language. That is to say, it is impossible to be precise and exact. This unfortunately has been too often forgotten by those who prepare elaborate celestial geographies and timetables for eternity.

The appeal which we have just made to the Bible constitutes another, a final objection which many feel in respect to the whole subject of

⁶ *The Christian Hope of Immortality*, p. 23.

eschatology. The Christian bases his belief in immortality in the last analysis upon revelation. He does not seek to prove the existence of life after death. He is not particularly interested in logical demonstration of this sort, but rather he *believes*, that is, he has faith in the future because of what God has revealed of Himself in Jesus Christ. Hence, his appeal for support is to the Bible rather than to his own, or anybody else's, theory on the subject. He is dependent in eschatology, as in other matters, upon revealed truth. But it is just here that many feel the Christian position to be weak, for it seems to suggest that reason, or if you like philosophy or science, is of no concern here. And since for many the antithesis between reason and revelation has been solved in favor of reason there would appear to be little supporting evidence for the Christian position. Not only so, but the appeal to reason in this matter is for the modern mind inconclusive and negative. Plato and Kant, to be sure, could speak as philosophers for immortality, but today the position of Hocking finds more acceptance, namely, that so far as philosophy is concerned all we can say about immortality is that whether it be real or not we have reason to think that it ought to be.⁷ The conclusion then is this: philosophy and science cannot be sure about the future, therefore we can know nothing about the future. It is here that young people particularly find themselves confused and perplexed.

If there is to be a revival of interest in things eschatological, adequate answers must be made to these and other questions, and the message of the Church must speak to such perplexing and preliminary objections. But important as this may be, it is still more important to proclaim the positive content of the Christian Hope. It is evident that much that has gone for proclamation has been hesitant and apologetic with the result that confusion worse confounded, as illustrated in the small sects, has taken the place of affirmative declaration.

III

There are two great problems of an eschatological nature which trouble people today and which consequently deserve the sober attention of the Christian preacher and theologian. The first has to do with biblical interpretation, or exegesis. The second is concerned with the meaning of history, or judgment.

⁷ *Thoughts on Death and Life*, p. 110.

If we were to examine theological thinking regarding the eschatological nature of the Kingdom of God, for example, we would discover how varied and contradictory the interpretations have been. Walter Rauschenbusch is a good American illustration of the social point of view which virtually eliminates the element of the future. Albert Schweitzer, on the other hand, has familiarized us with a thoroughgoing eschatological interpretation of the Kingdom of God, while Professor C. H. Dodd insists upon the "realized eschatology" of Jesus' teaching. In other words, this Christian concept, so central and significant, is subject to a wide diversity of exegetical interpretation. Should we understand the Kingdom as a utopian scheme, an eschatological vision, or a present reality? Perhaps Professor Dodd is pointing in the right direction.

The present reality of eternal life in the believing experience of the Christian is certainly a biblical emphasis and one that needs to be proclaimed today. It is interesting to note that in the Gospel account of the teaching of Jesus the Fourth Gospel uses the phrase "eternal life" in lieu of the synoptic phrase "Kingdom of God," and we may conclude that they are synonymous in this respect at least that they both suggest a present reality and a future or final reference. The emphasis too often has been one-sided, and in our day mostly upon the futuristic aspect. We tend to think of the Kingdom as coming and of eternal life in terms of immortality. Perhaps it is in the direction of revived interest in eschatology to emphasize the other or present experience of the Kingdom and eternal life. It has been pointed out repeatedly that eternal life stands primarily not for a greater length of life but for a new depth of life; it is not so much horizontal as perpendicular. It is life in time *and* eternity, for there is something paradoxical about the phrase itself—this word "eternal" alongside this word "life." This note, it seems, has been a neglected one and yet one that could well be sounded today. It is here, I think, that we can learn much from the Fourth Gospel as well as from the "realized eschatology" of Professor Dodd.

But what about the "residue" of eschatology, that final consummation which lies beyond this life? If the question—What is life after death like?—is the most searching and persistent of all eschatological questions, it is also the most difficult to answer. The issue has been put bluntly: either we must follow literally the biblical figures and pictures of what lies beyond death, or we must interpret all these as mere figures

and patterns of speech and rest content ultimately in a reverent but avowed agnosticism. And to be sure these two alternatives have been widely represented. Baillie speaks of the two views as "gnosticism" and "agnosticism," and pleads unmistakably for the latter, though he admits that "the religious mind can never afford to dispense entirely with such imagery" as the gnostics delight in employing. "It must always," he says, "tell itself Platonic 'myths.' Where knowledge fails, it must weave itself a story. When concepts are lacking, it must use pictures." (p. 198ff.) Unfortunately the antithesis between these two approaches has been much too rigid in many cases, and when this is so the whole Christian conception of the future is weakened. To be sure, we must be agnostic about some things, but that does not mean that the Christian Hope is a vague, ambiguous and ultimately inscrutable mystery—an unknown about which we can know nothing. That would not be a "hope" at all. Nor can we ignore the biblical imagery grotesque and materialistic as it sometimes undoubtedly is. Even if we rebel at a literal interpretation, these figures and symbols *mean* something. The difficulty has been that those who have stressed the ineffableness of the future have implied that the future is an unknown; whereas those who have stressed the biblical images have missed the woods for the trees, so to speak.

As an illustration of one way in which this confusion can be resolved, let me refer to an article by Professor Hugh Michael, of Toronto, entitled, "Why Don't We Preach the Apocalypse?"⁸ He is concerned over the fact that the Book of Revelation, which ought to speak so unmistakably to our time, has been studiously avoided by Christian preachers. There have always been those in the Christian Church who have used this book, particularly the twentieth chapter, as the basis for a Premillennial or Adventist interpretation of eschatology. They have vied with one another in predicting the date of Christ's return, describing in detail the conditions of life which will precede and follow the Second Advent. Others like Luther and Calvin and Zwingli for various reasons left the book with its symbolism unexplained. The position which Professor Michael takes, while neither new nor surprising, seems to be both sane and constructive. He concerns himself with the message of the book, and this he divides into five categories: its vivid sense of God, its unwavering faith in Jesus Christ, its keen realization of the evil of sin, its firm belief in the final

⁸ *Expository Times*, July, 1938, p. 438.

destruction of evil, and its clear vision of a redeemed humanity. This is one way certainly in which a most symbolic book can be interpreted in a positive and luminous way.

The other contemporaneous problem which deserves our serious attention has to do with the meaning of history, or more specifically the meaning of judgment. Arnold Toynbee's monumental *Study of History* is symptomatic of our concern with the rising and falling of civilizations and the significance of judgment, both present and final, in an adequate Christian philosophy of history.

In our own day the thought of God as Judge has been neglected and avoided in favor of a one-sided conception of God as Father. Why these should be regarded as conflicting is hard to see since Jesus Himself plainly speaks of God both as Father and Judge. In fact, mercy and judgment exist side by side in the biblical revelation of God, and the conception of judgment which we find in the Bible is simply a religious conviction growing out of the revelation of God as moral ruler of the universe. Final judgment is the climactic or eschatological aspect of past, present or everyday judgment. But as we have drifted away from the idea of God as Judge, we have also drifted away from the idea of final judgment. Metaphysically speaking, perhaps it is impossible to think of an end of time, and practically speaking we prefer Schelling's theology: "The history of the world is the judgment of the world." While there is certainly truth in this dictum, the question is being raised in our time whether or not we have lost our sense of the meaning of history simply because we have lost our appreciation of what the Bible means by final judgment. Michaelangelo's magnificent frescoe is a grand work of art, but his figure of Christ in the act of condemnation as the terrified masses stream to the judgment throne, is not a good or true commentary and has done much to repel the Christian conscience. So, too, Jonathan Edwards, who could in his own day preach so dramatically on the final judgment, has done much to substantiate the common charge that the Christian religion is a product of man's fear drawing its strength from its insistence on future rewards and punishment.

The time has come, therefore, when new and fresh insight into the biblical data on this subject is needed. We are beginning to realize the importance of the subject. It can be put in a hypothetical proposition: if final judgment is part of God's plan for mankind, then how important

it is to see history, past and present, in the light of its consummation! The Westminster Confession of Faith (Chapter 33: section 2) contains the words, "The end of God's appointing this day is for the manifestation of the glory of his mercy in the eternal salvation of the elect, and of his justice in the damnation of the reprobate." This is theological language for what faith feels keenly, namely, that good and evil cannot exist together forever. Such a conviction has always proved to be a powerful incentive for right daily living and a source of "consolation of the godly in their adversity." Thus we find Paul, for instance, writing: "For none of us liveth to himself, and none dieth to himself. For whether we live, we live unto the Lord; or whether we die, we die unto the Lord: whether we live therefore, or die, we are the Lord's. For this end Christ died and lived again, that he might be Lord of both the dead and the living. But thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? or thou again, why dost thou set at nought thy brother? for we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God" (Romans 14:7-10; cf. II Corinthians 5:10). It is something of this faith and penitence that is needed today in our moments of doubt and despair, and it may well be that this is the psychological moment, so to speak, in our history when this note needs to be recaptured.

These and other considerations suggest that if there is to be a genuine revival of interest in eschatology, certain principles of procedure would seem to be in order: first, the Christian attitude toward the future should be positive and constructive not wistful or apologetic; second, every effort should be made to simplify and clarify the content of the Christian hope without of course losing sight of the ineffable quality of the subject; and third, it must be made clear that eschatology is a necessary constituent of the Christian faith and not a mere after-thought or appendix. To be sure, faith in the future is a corollary of faith in God, but in these days when people are asking the pertinent question, "What in the world is God doing?" any answer which ignores or fails to take account of the ultimate goal is an unsatisfactory and, we may say, an un-Christian view.

Christ As a School of Culture

W. E. ORCHARD

WHAT has Christ to do with culture? Some cultured person might perhaps ask that contemptuously; and any simple Christian might ask when Christ said anything about culture.

It depends a little upon what we mean by culture. The word has recently been changing from its original meaning, and has now come to stand for the institutions, customs and ways of thought which characterize races, peoples, tribes, indeed, especially of savages who would be regarded as possessing no culture in the earlier sense of the word. For once it meant a certain refinement of taste, a delicate sensibility, a mental effect of careful, wide and yet selective education: something different from either learning or skill; more easily savored than defined, yet easily recognizable when present, and perhaps even more so when absent.

In the present scientific sense of culture everyone would acknowledge that Christianity had its own culture; for that would include its modes of worship, its codes of behavior, its organizations and customs, however strange or even barbaric some might at the same time judge these to be. Nor would anyone whose judgment was itself cultured refuse to admit that there were Christians who were also men of culture. Yet in the earliest sense of the word some might dispute that Christianity was itself a cause of culture, or even allied with it; that is if the word is to have its meaning of a kind of refinement in taste or manners.

It is true that culture has often concerned itself with external polish, fastidious taste, and has ended up artificial and dilettante; and the Christian outlook, being concerned with things fundamental, what is possible for all men, and far above everything ephemeral and superficial, would naturally and rightly be impatient with a culture of that kind. When Christianity began to make its claims for the allegiance of the classic world its absence of culture was frequently remarked upon. To the Classical culture Hebraic culture seemed uncouth, and indeed crude, caring little for art, forbidding the representation of living forms, despising philosophical speculation and unconcerned for beauty as such. Even when the gospel was translated into Greek, one who had been trained in the Greek of Homer, Aeschylus or Plato would at once notice the rougher style, the

absence of literary artifice and adornment, the simple direct concern, which brushed past many of the questions and interests which would engage the cultured Greek or Latin mind. Even the convert might remain long aware of the difference: Saint Augustine acknowledged it, and yet, admitting the contrasts, consoled himself that in all classical literature nothing could be found which had the consolation embodied in Christ's "Come to me all who labor and are burdened." Matthew Arnold, that apostle of culture, made a similar observation. Culture is not everything. It is a veneer, a polish, and unless there is something more substantial beneath, it can be hollow and worthless when the great issues of life and the deepest needs of humanity are concerned.

Yet out of the Christian culture, using the word scientifically, there has developed culture in the older, literary sense. As soon as Christianity had broken free from the Hebraic inhibitions there began in the catacombs that art which, combining classical form and symbolical significance, was to develop into the greatest the world has ever seen. Indeed no one could challenge the claim that Christianity has contributed to art, whether in architecture, sculpture, painting, music or poetry, so that in every one of these departments the supreme artistic achievement has been gained in endeavoring to express and adorn the doctrines and worship of the Christian religion. That art, however, has had its flowering and its decline, its decadent periods, when elaboration was mistaken for vitality and overdressed tawdriness overlaid its pristine beauty. At a recent exhibition in England of British Art there was evidently not only no great religious picture painted for four hundred years after the Reformation, but the pictures which achieved any sort of permanent recognition were chiefly portraits of court beauties, of Countesses, while the colors grew duller and duller; until the Pre-Raphaelite movement flashed its jewels before men's astonished eyes and turned to the Christian religion to find its highest inspiration, although some of its finest productions were at first hailed as offensive and unreal.

Nevertheless it may be asked whether Christ in His historical setting, or in His recorded words, has anything to teach us that bears upon culture. The answer is that He Himself distinctly declared that He had. The famous words, already quoted, that have induced so many souls of all kinds to come to Him to find rest, continue with the invitation, less often quoted or noticed. "Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, and

you shall find refreshment for your souls; for my yoke is easy (the Greek is really a culture word, meaning also pleasant, useful, elegant) and my burden is light." This saying of Christ is reminiscent of a somewhat similar saying of another Jesus: Jesus Ben Sirach, the author of the Book of Ecclesiasticus.¹ The differences are, however, more remarkable than the resemblances; and Christ's invitation may be based upon the earlier saying only in order to bring out the difference. For Christ is here distinctly offering Himself as a school of culture, but to those who are too poor to afford, or too occupied, to have the requisite leisure for the ordinary ways of learning. It is for this reason that He has specially to advertise Himself as a teacher of whom not even the backward or the timid need feel afraid; and the course as pleasant and easy.

It has, however, been questioned whether in advertising Himself as meek and humble of heart Christ did not offend in a kind of lapse of moral taste; for can the humble claim to be such, and remain so? It has to be remembered that Christ had to advertise Himself in this way so as to attract the fearful and apprehensive, seeing what so many pedagogues are like. Moreover, humility was hardly regarded as a virtue in the world to which Christ came. Indeed the very fact of who He was, God incarnate, needed some such assurance if sinful, slow and stupid men were to dare to approach Him. Without the fact of the Incarnation these words have little significance; but even with the Incarnation they still need emphasis; for with some views of God it would not be expected that the kind of character that the Divine would create would be meek and lowly. We can perhaps hardly think of God as being essentially humble; but we certainly must not think of Him as proud. God being always what He is, and of Himself alone, is not proud; that fault is reserved for upstart-man! Man shows his power by climbing; God by stooping. Man cannot get his desires unless he pushes and shouts. God just because He has all power, needs nothing of this.

It has been claimed, however, that the description of Christ as meek and mild has been overdone. Bernard Shaw says somewhere, he can find no trace in the Gospels of this meek and mild Jesus, but rather sees a person who is always hurling furniture down Temple steps. That is somewhat of an exaggeration. Our Lord not only advertises His own

¹ Draw near to me ye unlearned, and lodge in the house of instruction. . . . Put your neck under the yoke, and let your soul receive instruction. . . . Behold with your eyes, how that I laboured but a little, and found for myself much rest.

meekness, but Saint Paul particularly remarks upon it when he beseeches his somewhat crude converts by the meekness and gentleness of Christ. It perhaps does need to be pointed out that Christ's meekness was by no means inconsistent with strength, or left no room for severity. It was just because He was so strong that He could afford to be unaggressive. Charles Rann Kennedy has a Passion play which brings out the paradox in its very title: "The Terrible Meek!" It is true that Christ was sometimes very angry; but if the context is looked up it will be seen that the anger is further described as being grieved for the hardness of men's hearts. He was often in a real passion; but it was a passion of suffering for men's sins or sorrows. Indeed the very incident which has been so often appealed to as justifying all kinds of violent actions, and has been made to sanction bullets and bayonets, bombs and tanks, if looked at carefully, brings out just that fineness of the application of force in the exact degree which is necessary: which is one of the marks of a discerning spirit and a cultured soul. In the incident of the cleansing of the Temple, it must be admitted that, in all the circumstances, the scourge Christ used was more a symbol of authority than a weapon of offense. Indeed if the word which describes it is kept to its classical meaning it was "a whip of rushes," and therefore probably knotted there and then from the floor of the Temple. Further, Saint John's description warrants the assumption that while our Lord violently turned over the tables of the money-changers, He was more careful with the cages that held the doves, and said, "Take them away," while it was for the oxen and sheep that He reserved the mild scourge for driving them out.²

It is indeed somewhat strange, seeing that Christ was mostly on open-air preacher, that Saint Matthew should have applied to Him the prophecy that He would not strive or cry in the streets. The truth is that if an open-air preacher is wise that is just the course He will follow. Shout, and people will stand far off, or hurry by; speak quietly, and they will draw near or stop to hear what is being said. And we know this was Christ's method, for it is recorded that they drew near, all the publicans and sinners, to hear Him. They were not only drawn by His quiet voice,

² The Greek is a little ambiguous, but it is perhaps some confirmation of the translation here adopted that it has the support of Doctor Moffat's *New Testament in Modern English*, as well as of Father Spencer's translation: an agreement of Protestant and Catholic which is at this point very welcome; though we should be loath to take away the solitary support that the more belligerent type of Christian has so much relied on!

but they wondered at the gracious words that fell from His lips. Here grace has its classical meaning of charm; a charm that could open the stubborn heart and win its way behind all but the most obdurate prejudice of the proud and suspicious Pharisee.

It may yet be asked, however, when Christ ever said anything that has any bearing upon the subject of culture as, for instance, governing artistic appreciation. Nevertheless He laid down a standard of incorruptible taste when He declared that not Solomon in all his glory was arrayed like the flowers of the field. Incorruptible taste? Yes, incorruptible either by the costliness of Solomon's robes, of the commonness of the flowers of the field.

Christ even had something to say about manners, that great sign of culture; though some who think themselves cultured also think they are thereby allowed to be rude; indeed, who can be so cutting and contemptuous as those who think they are cultured when they are dealing with those they think are not? For Christ gives us the quite useful piece of advice that when we go out to dinner we had better not push our way to the highest place, lest our host have to tell us that is already reserved for someone else; but taking the lowest place, perhaps have the pleasure of being invited to come up higher. Indeed, there are other incidents in the Gospels which show Christ's true culture. When He was invited to dine with the wealthy Pharisee, it may have been the kindest intention that omitted for His sake the kiss of greeting and the foot-washing ceremony. For they were manners and rules of good society that His host no doubt thought the young wayside preacher might not be used to. It was the first thing He noticed had been omitted! He had to teach His disciples good manners right to the end. At the Last Supper the room was furnished with the water pots for the foot washing; but no servants were allowed to be present; Saint Peter had recently been made the leader of the Apostolic band, with glorious honors and titles; they had all been disputing on the journey as who was the greatest among them; and therefore none of them had offered to undertake this lowly service. And so in the middle of supper Christ, knowing whence He came and whither He was going, girded Himself with a towel and, taking a basin, began to do in humility what they in pride had left undone; thus teaching them and us for all time a much-needed lesson.

Here is a school to which we all ought to put ourselves, and indeed

a school we should never leave. For Christ has lessons to teach our souls we shall only slowly imbibe, and contact with the world, not to say training in other schools, will be tempted to make us forget. This schooling will be obtained first by soaking ourselves in the Gospels; though it will depend a little what we seek there what we find, and how long we seek what we get from them. There was a scholar who explained that his wonderful knowledge of the Gospels was due to the fact that he had soaked himself in them for years. Yet strangely enough he was one of the most boorish of men, and brusque to the point of constant rudeness. Yet there was another, equally saturated with the Gospel and he was the soul of courtesy.

But more than Gospel study will be needed. Christ cannot be learned through a mere correspondence course. There will have to be added to it the intercourse of humble prayer and the communication of His own lowly and thus instituted sacraments. It would be surely impossible to speak much to Him who is at once King of the Heavenly Court and Prince of Peace, without the language we must use toward Him, flavoring our whole speech; difficult, one would imagine, to use words for sacred purposes very frequently, and then as often profanely in speech with our fellows. The accents of prayer would surely modulate all our common speech, elevate it and refine it. It is a lesson on good manners to kneel at the same altar steps with the rich and poor, the rough and the refined, the learned and ignorant. Yet even here will depend a little what is consciously sought, how near we come, how deeply Christ dwells within us. Indeed it will not be our attitude toward Him, King of Glory, but our attitude to those behind whom He stands unseen; the poor, the tire-some, the worthless; indeed the least of His brethren. For our culture will be most manifest, not when we are confronted with pictures or statuary, music or literature, but with God's images in men, however defaced and overwritten with life stories other than that of His purpose for us all. For our manners, our courtesy, and therefore the culture of our souls, are tested not by our behavior to our superiors, or to our equals, but toward those whom we consider to be our inferiors. And thus we shall be judged at the last; not our creed, but our culture; not the courtesy we shall put on then when the Judge appears, but the courtesy that we have shown along the common ways of life, and in contact with humanity.

Contemporary Literature and Preaching

CLARENCE SEIDENSPINNER

I ONCE knew a minister who confessed to his congregation that he permitted himself to read one novel a year. No doubt he would like to have read more fiction but he felt that such additional reading of secular books would be an embezzlement of his time, precious time which should be devoted to his theological studies. Apparently he saw no relationship between his knowledge of contemporary literature and his work as a minister. Nor did he see any relationship between his inordinately dull preaching and this ascetic discipline which was self-imposed.

Undoubtedly many ministers are just as provincial in their reading as was this good man. For one reason or another they do not touch the rich stream of novels and poems, biographies and criticisms which flow from the modern press. Speak to them of Thomas Mann or Franz Werfel, of Edna St. Vincent Millay or Robinson Jeffers, of John Dos Passos or Ernest Hemingway, and they do not understand you. These are alien names to ears that are bent to the homiletic ground.

Granted that good literature belongs to the kingdom of ends and has no direct utilitarian value. Granted that a great book or a charming lyric or a buoyant novelette should be read for its own wonderful sake. Granted that a man should be able at night to put on his smoking jacket, relax in a comfortable chair, stretch his legs, and just for the joy of it, lose himself in the pages of a fascinating book. Nevertheless, the minister who loiters in this kingdom of ends will find himself in the possession of treasures which have a fruitful relationship to his function as a preacher. When he enters the pulpit on Sunday morning he will make the happy discovery that there are certain preaching values in contemporary literature. These values will immensely fortify him as he stands before his thoroughly modern congregation. Four of these values are of particular help in his hour of homiletic need.

I

Surely the minister who is preaching to modern men will want to know the best that is known, thought and said, not only in the past, but also in his own day.

We are agreed that unless he knows the classical literature of yesterday, it hardly can be said that he is educated at all. The great books and ideas of the past are part of the system of communication by which intelligent men speak to one another. It is expected that a simple reference to a classical concept or name or book will be enough to arouse the rich train of association. How limited a man would be in his ability to communicate, who could not make reference to the books or ideas of Job or John, Saint Augustine or Saint Thomas Aquinas, Dante or Leonardo, Shakespeare or Milton, Wordsworth or Henry Fielding, Arnold or Carlyle. These are names which everyone is expected to know.

Just as lamentable as is the minister's ignorance of the best that has been known and thought in the past, is the fine disdain he may express for the books and ideas of today. He may rationalize his ignorance by saying that he has no interest in the ephemeral books of a decadent age. The fact remains, however, that unless he is familiar with these books, he will not know what his own people are reading and thinking. Thus he will be placed in both a pastoral and a homiletic disadvantage. He will live in one intellectual world and his people will live in another and communication between these two worlds will be greatly reduced.

Nor will such a minister know the seminal minds and ideas that are motivating modern men. Great far-reaching beams of thought are spanning our earth and when they come into juxtaposition, bathe it in a golden cauldron of light. How futile it is for a man who wants to influence public opinion to persist in living in an intellectual back eddy from whence he can see this light only from a great distance, instead of living within its luminous core to become part of the increasing splendor. How can a man preach effectively unless he travels on these beams of thought to become part of the light of the world today?

After all, what Matthew Arnold said concerning the poet, can also be said about the preacher. ". . . everyone can see that a poet, for instance, ought to know life and the world before dealing with them in poetry; and life and the world being in modern times very complex things, the creation of a modern poet, to be worth much, implies a great critical effort behind it; else it must be a comparatively poor, barren and short-lived affair. This is why Byron's poetry had so little endurance in it, and Goethe's so much; both Byron and Goethe had a great productive power, but Goethe's was nourished by a great critical effort providing

the true materials for it, and Byron's was not; Goethe knew life and the world, the poet's necessary subjects, much more comprehensively and thoroughly than Byron. He knew a great deal more of them, and he knew them much more as they really are."

For example, consider the profound and brilliant novels of Thomas Mann. By some he is considered one of the greatest living interpreters of the soul. He has been particularly concerned about four different cultural problems. What is the soul like when it functions as the artist? What happens to the soul when it lives in a decadent age, an age that has no answer to the major questions of the human spirit? What happens to the soul when it becomes spirit driven and strives to live in the light of the knowledge of God? What happens to the soul when it is caught between the forces of Fascism, negation and falsehood, and those of democracy, humanity and truth?

Surely the thoughtful minister will be troubled by these cultural problems, will want to find some satisfactory answers for himself, will want to reflect in his sermons the most careful thinking regarding these situations. He will need to know the great beam of thought which Doctor Mann sent over the earth in *The Magic Mountain*, a book which gathers into its symphonic pattern all the multifarious philosophies and forces of our bourgeois, decadent age, an age unable to answer the deep questions of the human spirit, and consequently one which must inevitably break down into war and disaster because it has no strengthening supports. In all modern literature, there is no comparable treatment to *The Magic Mountain* concerning the fundamental causes of civilization's collapse.

Disillusioned by *The Magic Mountain* and by the objective events swirling around him, the thoughtful minister will long to know the true spiritual capacity of the soul. Again he will want to travel on a beam of thought released by Thomas Mann in the Joseph novels. Here he will discover the spirit-driven soul in the dawn of history, in a time more simple than the present, when the human spirit in its search for God, stood clearly against the horizon, for it was not encumbered with the bourgeois trappings of today. In the stories of Jacob and Joseph, Doctor Mann has revealed the progress of mankind as it learns to listen for God's guiding word, as it discovers the way to successful group fellowship, as it finds out by costly mistake the proper relationship between body and mind, and finally, as it learns how to serve the peoples of the earth. Here is a tale of epic proportion which the minister will need.

The minister who does read the great books and the popular journals of his own day will furnish his mind with concepts and patterns of expression complemented by those of his congregation. What he knows, his people know; what he discusses, they understand. In his congregation are men and women who are reading these interpretive novels of Thomas Mann, the proletarian novels of Steinbeck and Dos Passos, the historical and neo-catholic novels of Willa Cather, the cynical and pessimistic poetry of Robinson Jeffers, the cheerless sonnets concerning death by Edna St. Vincent Millay, the war novels of Hemingway, the critical appreciations of Van Wyck Brooks and the Beards, and so on.

Here is a wonderful substratum of thinking and knowledge by which the minister can enrich much of his preaching. Here is a general cultural background which he can more or less assume that the people know in a general way. He is familiar with this process in regard to the Bible for in his preaching he assumes that the people know the great legendary figures of the Old Testament, certain devotional and prophetic passages that have an abiding appeal, the whole story of Jesus and His teachings, and something about Paul and the early Church. The possession of this common biblical background on the part of preacher and people, decidedly simplifies the business of sermonizing, for the simple mention of a name will convey a thought and arouse a whole background of understanding.

Why not use this same process in regard to the common possession of a contemporary background arising from the journals, books and ideas of today? Why not refer to timely books and articles and ideas? Why not speak of the great minds that are crystallizing human experience today? These names and ideas are in the air. Just as trees and plants, using the chemistry of chlorophyll, extract the carbon dioxide from the atmosphere to combine it with precious minerals from the ground to create living protoplasm; so the alert preacher, using his intelligence, will take these ideas in the air today and combine them with his rich background of biblical lore to produce the vital tissue of a vigorous sermon. Thus the preacher will be a living voice as he speaks to contemporary and grateful men.

II

The minister who reads the current books and magazines will find in them a second value for his preaching. This value may be called the development of a sense of literature.

All literature is the result of the crystallization of human experience

into words. The man who wants to write or speak must know the uses and arrangements of words. Some flaming experience or some deep insight comes to him which he wants to record in order that it may be shared by other people. He then faces the technical problem of recording his experience or insight in the most convincing possible way. He first searches for the proper pattern. It may be some poetic form, the essay, the short story, the novelette, the long novel, the various dramatic forms or the sermon. Then he pours his words into the skeletal pattern in the attempt to make it intelligible and vital. The manner in which he tries to bring this form to life and the way in which he uses his words is called style. Form and style are the fundamental elements of literature.

Obviously, the more adequate a man's sense of literature is, the better he will effect this process of crystallization. Surely the preacher is no exception to this rule, for essentially, the problem of his sermon is one of literature. Granted that he is an intelligent, sympathetic and religious person who manages to achieve the proper homiletic insights, his basic task is to put that insight into vibrant, compelling words. He selects the proper sermonic form and clothes it with words. In this act, he comes into the realm of literature.

Like other writers and speakers, the minister will need to judge his sermon on the same basis that they judge their productions. He will need to ask himself three important questions:

1. Does my sermon crystallize a worthy idea or emotion? Many a sermon breaks down at this initial point, for when this searching question is asked the honest minister is obliged to confess that the theme of the day was really too trivial to warrant exposition in the sustained pattern of the sermon. It might have been appropriate for use in a devotional meditation. Many such themes the minister is tempted to use because of some subtle nuance of meaning or emotion which appeals to him or which he wants to convey to the congregation. The application of our standard, however, will rule these lesser themes out of the serious realms of sermonizing. A knowledge of modern literature quickly reveals the fact that in a streamlined age only the larger and more adequate ideas or emotions command the larger literary forms.

2. This brings us to the second standard. Does the particular homiletic pattern chosen adequately convey the insight of the preacher? Just as poetry, for example, has many different stanza forms; so the sermon has at least half a dozen basic forms of its own. The wise minister who

desires to preach a sermon designed to change public opinion will not choose for his homiletic pattern the simple exposition. Nor if he wishes to support a simple exposition with a definite emotional coloring, will he choose the more circuitous form designed to change opinion. Like other authors, the preacher must have a sense of structure or form if he is convincingly to build and use the skeletal frames of his sermons. Like other authors, too, he must sense the particular contemporary feeling for structure if he is to interest modern men, and this sense he develops by reading the current books and journals.

3. This ability to judge the sermon on the basis of these critical standards may be called a sense of literature, and this ability comes from long familiarity with the best contemporary usage. This is particularly true in regard to the third question which the minister asks concerning his sermon. Is the style satisfactory?

What a varied assortment of styles we find in the pulpit. Some preachers are verbose, redundant, loose and oratorical. They do not really love and appreciate words. They do not know that such words as wonderful, awful, splendid and beautiful—yes, and even God, Christ and the cross—must be saved for the great occasions. Other preachers are pedantic, stilted and academic in their preaching. Their sermons sound like a chapter in German metaphysics. Other preachers are staccato, biting and nervous in the pulpit. When they squeeze the homiletic sponge, the “acids of modernity” run their caustic and destructive way into the despairing congregation. Brilliant these preachers are, but never satisfying.

Familiarity with the writers of today will help the minister to understand that the best contemporary style is easy, strong, clear and incisive. Such men as Walter Lippmann, Ernest Hemingway and Van Wyck Brooks know how to write, and this is the style they use. It reflects the clear, frank, familiar spirit of modern men. It is the style in which the modern congregation will feel at home. The thoughtful preacher, knowing that such a style cannot be achieved overnight, would do well to read these men and to cultivate this style, in order that when he stands up to preach on Sunday, he may do so with interest and conviction.

III

When he enters the pulpit, many a minister will be grateful for a third value in contemporary literature. Sometimes he will discover that the basic concept or emotion of his sermon can be brought to fine expression

in a brilliant passage of prose or poetry. This is not the old-fashioned homiletic gruel that our fathers called the illustration when some touching incident was recounted to heighten the moment's emotion.

In modern use, such an expression is sharply focused, brilliant, devastating, beautiful perhaps. It is a contemporary expression of what the preacher has been outlining in his exposition. It brings richness and vitality and overtones to the sermon. In no sense is it an inserted embellishment to dazzle the people and inflate the ministerial ego. Rather, it is organic to the whole sermon, part of its rich texture, life of its life and blood of its blood. To discard the expression would wound the living, vibrant sermon; cripple its effectiveness; and leave an irreparable loss.

Turn to any volume of sermons by competent craftsmen, and you will see this process illustrated. Here is a sermon by Dean Gilkey, entitled *Journeys Out and Home*. He quotes some "memorable lines of Kipling," which have always appealed "to us younger men because they state in such unconventional yet convincing phrase this same faith of the text in the God who inspires and accompanies all high adventure."

Doctor Tittle preaches on the topic, *Is Religion a Way of Escape?* He brings the sermon to a fine conclusion by quoting some lines from the memoirs of Ramsay MacDonald concerning his wife. This passage brings to concrete and vital expression the deep faith that in the midst of life's struggle God is our refuge and comfort.

In his last book Doctor Fosdick has a sermon entitled, *Winning the War of Nerves*. Very effectively he quotes some lines from Chesterton, beginning with the words, "Though giant rains put out the sun. . . ." These lines bring into bright relief the indomitable spirit of the man who believes in God. After reading this poem in its sermon context, any man can see that the minister who fails to utilize this treasure house of pungent, contemporary expression is missing a golden, homiletic opportunity that will bring his abstractions to radiant life.

IV

There is still a fourth value for the preacher in current books. Sometimes a whole sermon will grow out of an article, a poem, a play or a novel. As the minister reads, his train of associations will be stimulated and many a germinal idea will come to knock at his homiletic door.

These sermons that come while the minister browses among some

new books will be born almost in their entirety. The whole concept and its outline will suddenly appear. The whole, overpowering emotion to be crystallized will suddenly take form. There is no laborious outlining to be done, step by step and deduction following deduction. The sermon appears in its wholeness and this is the best way for a sermon to come. This is the way of all art and artists, for the poet and painter visualize their subjects in glorious entirety before they ever touch pencil or brush.

Again one might turn to almost any volume of sermons to see this process illustrated. Here is another sermon by Doctor Tittle, Testing Religious Faith. It grew out of a novel by Margaret Wilson, *The Able McLaughlins*, in which "frequent reference is made to the religious faith of the pioneer, his naïve belief in One whose very name was medicine in sickness and light and love and rest."

In reviewing his work during the past year or two, one preacher declared that four of his most effective sermons came to life in this way. He preached on the topic, Religion Strikes Reality, which was a direct answer to Channing Pollock's article, "Why I Don't Go to Church." Another sermon developed the analogy contained in Lew Sarett's profound poem, "Clipped Wings." Still another sermon grew out of Franz Werfel's compelling novel, *Embezzled Heaven*. Then there was Hemingway's excellent novel, *For Whom the Bell Tolls*, which told the story of the Spanish Civil War in which the forces of fascism were pitched against those of democracy. In this struggle we are all involved, for in the fine words of John Donne:

"No man is an Iland, intire of it selfe; every man is a peace of the Continent, a part of the maine. . . . And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee."

This type of preaching is often found very satisfying, for it results from the meeting and fusion of the minister's mind with contemporaries in the literary field. This transaction results in a still deeper insight, a new and necessary emphasis, in a further and more refined crystallization.

Here, then, through familiarity with the books and journals of today, is one way for the minister as preacher to count in modern life. Let him know and enjoy the best that is being thought and said today, for in this steady stream of literary production he will find the vortex and melting pot of the world's interest and thought.

No Night for the Valiant

EARL MARLATT

KEEP the faith fires burning. This might have been the title of every book chosen almost at random for review in this quarter's fiction. In each case, through changing generations, in familiar or unknown countries, the perilous fight is won by faith. Sometimes it is faith in freedom, Mother Earth, Brother Sea or Father Time; again it is faith in something less tangible and more mysterious: love that begets and forgives or life that goes on forever. The factor of victory is infinitely various but the common denominator is the same: faith.

If you happen to be one of the millions who heard the nation-wide broadcast for the Red Cross on the Sunday nearest Memorial Day, 1940, you will remember the letter read by Lynn Fontanne from the last act of the play in which she was then appearing on Broadway, *There Shall Be No Night*. It was a Finnish doctor's diagnosis of war as a disease threatening the lives of individuals or nations or civilizations. None of these things can be destroyed, the doctor wrote, if people will only hold fast to their faith in the final victory of right over might and refuse to let their essential spirits be broken by defeat or captivity or death.

Miss Fontanne added: "A great many people ask us where Robert Sherwood got the title for the play—*There Shall Be No Night*—and what it means. It was taken from the Bible, the Book of Revelation, and it means that there shall be no blackout of civilization."

For anyone who knew that passage of Scripture (Revelation 22:1-5) ending "and they need no candle, neither light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light," Miss Fontanne's broadcast was a call for resolution at a time when all that we treasure seems lost: "There shall be no blackout of civilization," she virtually said, if only people do not lose faith in freedom and in life and in all brave spirits who share that freedom and that life with the Lord God, the light of the world.

That same prescription of faith and loyalty as the only cure for the ravages of war is written indelibly in the quarter's fiction. It deals with critical cases all the way from *The Perilous Night* of the American Revolution to the brave new dawn, which St. John Ervine, writing for the ghost of *Sophia*, found beyond "the door of darkness," which to discover

we must open too. The journey is tortuous, as Omar also knew, but at the end of it, whether in the tavern or the Temple, there is light.

For Burke Boyce, the young but old-masterful author of *The Perilous Night*, the undying flame actually flashes first in Dubois' tavern beneath the Hudson Highlands. Here the not-yet-ragged Continentals—it was 1776—were accustomed to foregather for sallies against the embattled tories—men “with their bodies this side the ocean and their heads the other and necks that wanted to be stretched.” Sometimes the aroused patriots find easier marks for their blunderbusses in homesick Hessians or rollicking Redcoats who never learn that an expedition through the woods is not a picnic. Even so the Americans, then as now, unable to unite for defense, fail to take advantage of the enemy's errors and prolong the war for seven years.

That is the perilous night, during which the faith fires almost gutter out. Looted by professional patriots and tories alike, the true loyalists, Zach Dubois, Asa Howell and David Milk, fight on together for their farms, their friends in both camps and most of all for moral freedom. This alone, as Asa realizes, “gives independence to our traits as well as our trade and compels us to shape a form for our spiritual salvation as well as our political.” With this insight Asa follows through from the tavern to the Temple, where, eventually, “the one true light” flames again in christening candles for Tempy Ann's baby, “a Frenchman's illegitimate brat in a decent house of worship.” This also, as Asa knew and as Burke Boyce was trying to say throughout the book, must be faced and forgiven as a part of “the great price” men must always pay for “this freedom.”

“I am beginning to learn,” Asa says in the darkest hour of the perilous night—it was just before dawn at Yorktown—“that war brings as many scenes and disruptions from within as from without. We must be prepared to admit the one before we can defeat the other.”

That one observation makes this book about a Colonial war as timely as today's newscast and as timeless as Lynn Fontanne's reflections on *There Shall Be No Night*. Nevertheless it should not be concluded blandly that *The Perilous Night* is just another novel with a purpose or that it is propaganda rather than art. Surely we have had enough of that. In fact, Boyce goes out of his way to show that both positions toward the war, the tory and the patriot, had their points. In any case the sincerity of their

devotees called for other treatment than the rope's end given to Richard Wolven, Tempy Ann's "Cowboy" lover, and to "Hale in the Bush," when he was captured by zealots in the other camp, the Redcoats at New York. Out of it all Asa Howell emerges as the Prospero of the piece who must somehow still the tempest, reconcile Ariel and Caliban, and demonstrate again that "the rarer action is in virtue than in vengeance."

In Stuart Cloete's novel about another war for freedom around *The Hill of Doves* in the Transvaal rather than the Hudson Highlands, this same service is performed by a character as Shakespearean and, I believe, as immortal as Prospero or Puck or Peter Pan. He is the blind shepherd boy, Boetie Van Der Berg, who steals the show completely from the lovers, Lena and Dirk, as idyllically mated as Ferdinand and Miranda were in *The Tempest*, and even from General Joubert—Oom Franz—and his dashing commandos, who, in 1880, won the first Boer War for independence. Perhaps the novelist—he is also a first-rate poet—meant that the soul of Boetie, "like a star," should shine through the perilous night of this other war for freedom and bring white peace to the Hill of Doves. At any rate, whether by design or an accident of genius, Boetie's sightless eyes—"brilliant blue, flower blue, the color of a bright-blue sky"—like old blind Homer's or Milton's, see deeper into the mysteries of heartbreak and ecstasy than soldiers or lovers or far adventurers ever can.

"He had something that no one else had," Stuart Cloete explains, "time to himself; time in which to think and wait and listen and feel. Most people heard nothing. They did not know about the little rustlings in the grass, or the sound of wings in the evening when the doves went down to water. They missed so much in not knowing the feel of things—round things, eggs, water-worn stones; the rough surfaces of rock, hot beneath their fingers, or leather, or of skin. They might be sorry for him, but he was happy because he had so much."

All of this he poured into his small bare feet on the perilous night when his toes must be eyes for the tired commandos as they groped their way up the Hill of Doves. On its crest the British were asleep, never dreaming that the Boers, led by a blind boy, would attack at dawn. Boetie was not afraid. For him the path to the mountain pasture was as bright at midnight as at noonday. He knew every pebble and crevice on it and the texture and coolness of every bush beside it. For years his toes and his fingertips had been his eyes and they made him, tonight, the one person

in the Transvaal who could lead Joubert's soldiers to victory and the old wild freedom of the veldt. The eager commandos, bound to Boetie by climbers' ropes and faith in his blind leadership, followed on as docilely and as silently as his sheep behind him in warmer mornings, when he was surprising no one and might play his shepherd's pipe. And so the miracle happened: a blind boy led the Boers to victory and a vision of brotherhood which the Lincoln Joubert put into his last address to his soldiers:

"I earnestly implore each one of you to let us hear no more, after this day, of Boer or Englishman, or Hollander, or of Kaffir. Let us bury the dead completely, or only remember them for our good. . . . We all come of one stock, and so should live in the land as brothers."

All of this takes no account of Lena's great love for Dirk, Boetie's far-seeing, hard-riding brother. Their romance, interrupted by the war, blooms again on the Hill of Doves, from which the commandos have driven the marauding Redthroats. But even at the wedding blind Boetie steals the spotlight from the bride and groom, old Oupa, and the great Joubert. On his new pipes that all the people, his friends and brothers, had given him, he plays the marrying song, as his present for Dirk and Lena. As he played, his music "brought tears to her eyes to think of the magnificence of God's plan, of its illimitable beauty, of its scope, of His great love for all living things, and the powers He gave to men, of love, of courage in adversity, of charity."

So, in the Father's own good time, did peace come back to the valiant Boers and freedom to the veldt ploughed by the turning wheels of the Great Trek and watered by the blood and tears of heroes; and not the least of these was blind Boetie, the shepherd singer of the Hill of Doves.

Come to think of it, Mary Ellen Chase's *Windswept*, seen with perspective, says the same thing that Stuart Cloete says in *The Hill of Doves* and through the same kind of characters. It does have Jan Pisek and Philomena to keep the faith fires burning on the altars of Freedom and Mother Earth; but it also has the Marstons, under the spell of *Windswept*, wanting not only anchorage but horizon, and finding Brother Sea and Father Time as comforting in sorrow and as redeeming in danger as the good earth from which men sprang and to which they must return after the last perilous night.

"Out of danger," Ann Marston thinks in the very first chapter, "had sprung the involuntary need for safety, out of foreboding and fear, the

need of confidence and courage, out of suspicion, the need of faith. . . . Was this light over years that had gone, this golden branch among the shadows, this quickening to the life immortal, a gift or an accident or a discovery?"

By a stroke of genius, or a literary device which James Hilton has used most memorably in our time, that question, put in the first chapter, is not finally answered until the last page, when Ann comes back to the altar lights at Windswept: "This sea, this shore, these minutes and hours, red berries in the tangled grass. . . . One can, even in these new, sad days, rise to the life immortal," she thought; "one can find the golden branch among the shadows."

And it was so surely there that Julie, another Frenchman's love child "in a decent house of worship," saw it too and thought of it as "the flames of Pentecost, coming with a rushing mighty wind, and still enabling young men to see visions and old men to dream dreams."

I am quoting liberally, I know, but I am doing it deliberately lest I be accused of reading into *Windswept* a spiritual meaning which is not there. It is there, as bravely sung by generations of Marstons on a surf-battered headland in Maine as by Van Der Bergs, Boetie, Dirk and Lena, on the Hill of Doves. Although they are centuries and almost poles apart, their stout hearts hammer out the same murmurous music, in tune with the earth as it turns on its axis, the sea as it answers the call of the moon, and the seven spheres as they revolve around the sun.

Verily the sea-deep music of the chapel bell—Jan heard once when it was rung by a monstrous December gale, which dashed the spray over the steeple—sounds through all the storms over Windswept and makes it a shrine at which all lovers of the soil and the sea may keep the faith fires burning.

After three books as solid, as full-bodied and fourth-dimensional as these, any reader is likely to feel a sense of letdown when he comes to the thinner, less-convincing novels about the present war. Perhaps the authors are too close to the far-flung battle line to get perspective on it as these other authors did on earlier wars. Or perhaps they have not yet fathomed its mysteries so that they must write about it, if they write at all, in cryptic, parabolical terms, as Charles Morgan does in *The Empty Room*, or with stark realism—"let the chips fall where they may"—as Pearl Buck does in *Dragon Seed*.

Of the two books, the shorter one, *The Empty Room*, is, in my opinion, the better. Morgan deplors what war, especially the present World War, does to nations and individuals, but he insists that peoples and persons are not destroyed by their enemies or their own disloyalties; they may even be reborn from that agony and emerge with new strength and deepened devotions. I have the feeling that Morgan is thinking of France, when he writes about Venetia, and her seduction by Besting, bloated with his ill-gotten profits (Germany). Henry, her husband, insists that the ghost of her unfaithfulness, which haunts the empty room in desolated England, can be laid only by forgiving love, born of faith in her undying beauty and integrity. It should be added that the parable does not mar the artistry of a romance kept piquant by a dash of mystery.

Curiously enough, Pearl Buck deals with the same problem in *Dragon Seed*, where China is ravished by Japan rather than France by Germany. But there is nothing cryptic or allegorical in Mrs. Buck's treatment. Hers is a forthright realism, occasionally made mystical by Ling Tan's devotion to the good earth and the natural processes by which it bears crops and children out of the same harrowing labor, pain and ecstasy. In fact, a superficial reader might conclude that Mrs. Buck equates fecundity with profundity and potency with power. Actually she means, I think, that the one is the ever-living source of the other which no invader can capture or destroy.

Thus far she keeps pace with Charles Morgan, or Burke Boyce, Stuart Cloete and Mary Ellen Chase. But no further: all of these find tolerance or forgiving love the balm in Gilead, or even Armageddon; not so Mrs. Buck; with a plot which is courageously authentic and with documentation, we hope, for the outrages it recounts, she reveals only lust, cruelty and greed for power in "the evil little men from the East Ocean country"; they can be stopped and hurled back into the sea, she seems to say, only by intensifying hatred from generation to generation and, at the same time, by holding doggedly to the good earth from which braver mothers will bear stronger sons to avenge the wrongs done to less militant fathers.

This one-track motif, plus an overdependence on coincidence to resolve the plot, makes *Dragon Seed* pot-boiling propaganda rather than first-rate art; and from the artist who wrote *The Good Earth*, *The Mother* and *The Patriot*, which has never been praised enough, discriminating readers will be satisfied with nothing less than art.

This they get, *par excellence*, in the last novel reviewed in this quarter's fiction, St. John Ervine's *Sophia*. These other books have had "intimations of immortality"; *Sophia* achieves it, not only in the action of the story but in the artistry with which it is told. Surely no one since Dante has explored "the undiscovered country whence no traveler returns" with a sounder map of the universe than St. John Ervine uses, or a truer theological compass than the Rev. James Considine, vicar of Far Seldom, bequeathed to his favorite daughter, Sophia, the late wife of the Rev. Godfrey Alderson, rector of Great Torping; for, as the book begins, its heroine, Sophia, is literally "shuffling off this mortal coil" and taking off timorously, like a butterfly from its chrysalis, into what Milton called "the circumambient dark."

But St. John Ervine, again like Dante, must keep the bright adventure realistic; consequently, only a few pages further, Sophia "stretches her soul luxuriously, and as she does so, feels bits of her body sticking to it." It was hard to leave the meadows in blossom time even though she had lately learned the truth about "dear Godfrey," her husband: in his young manhood he had been ambitious and promising; now, "it was enough for him, apparently, that he filled twenty minutes every Sunday morning and every Sunday evening with a number of related, but undisturbing words." Sophia, a ghost of her once vivacious self—her father had called her "Bright Eyes"—decides that she must haunt Godfrey, at least until she has saved her daughter, Ann; Ann must not be ruined by Godfrey's thoughtlessness, which had brought her, Sophia, to candle-lighting time at midday.

With this realization that there is still something she can do for the living, Sophia knows, suddenly, that only her body is dead. She laughed "a little silvery laugh that seemed to sparkle. It was like the sound of falling water that has caught the sunlight as it falls. It fell in clear and glistening drops that murmured like bees booming among blossoms. It tinkled and shone."

That kind of shining, immortal laughter transfigures the twilight of Sophia's life with Godfrey and the gray dawn of the morning after when she must grope her way with Sue Somerson—she had died "just before teatime, the one meal of the day she really enjoyed"—to "the abodes where the eternal are." En route they meet the soul of a man who was hanged for murder; the inseparable souls of Alice and Tom as

eternally wedded in death as Paolo and Francesca; and at last the small limping soul of seven-year-old Joyce who hadn't jumped in time to miss the motor car and whose trembling spirit-hand still reaches for Sue's or Sophia's at every street crossing. So did the dead lead the dead and refuse to leave the living until they had quickened them to a heightened realization of the preciousness of life.

This thrice-cut preview does bodily and spiritual harm to *Sophia* and even more to James Considine, her father, who was a kind of a cross between Boetie, the blind shepherd boy in *The Hill of Doves*, and Asa Howell, the father in *The Perilous Night*. Perhaps that is the reason Sophia finally saw him, like "a light coming through" and let the immortal radiance of his spirit lead her through the valley of the shadow "on her way to see God." As "its rays fell upon her and warmed her and lifted up her heart," she said, turning to Joyce and Sue: "Come along now. I think I see my way."

That is St. John Ervine's new revelation from a latter-day Patmos: "There shall be no night" for those who keep the faith fires burning and who let their spirit lamps light the way to a new heaven and a new earth.

The Perilous Night. By BURKE BOYCE. New York: The Viking Press. 1942. pp. 560. \$2.75.

The Hill of Doves. By STUART CLOETE. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1941. pp. 633. \$2.75.

Windswept. By MARY ELLEN CHASE. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1941. pp. 440. \$2.75.

The Empty Room. By CHARLES MORGAN. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1941. pp. 164. \$2.00.

Dragon Seed. By PEARL BUCK. New York: The John Day Company. 1942. pp. 378. \$3.00.

Sophia. By ST. JOHN ERVINE. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1941. pp. 351. \$2.50.

Book Reviews

The Church and the New Order. By WILLIAM PATON. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1942. pp. 188. \$1.50.

This book is a brief, clear and very readable setting forth of the problems and hopes of a new world order. Inevitably much that it contains is not new, but the material is brought together in small compass and presented in logical and interesting fashion.

The author, Doctor William Paton, has played a large and influential part in the Ecumenical Movement and is one of those Englishmen who know America and Americans well and talk their language. In a letter to this reviewer some time ago he said of this book:

"I wrote it with one eye on your countrymen, and I hope I have helped rather than hindered the objectives which I know you have in mind."

In the preface he sets forth his theme in the form of four ideas, as follows:

1. That Christians (and all others who seek to apply to secular affairs the principles, criteria and spirit of true religion) must face and answer the questions raised by the fact of power and the part it plays in human affairs;
2. The key to the future lies in the use we make of the present emergency and the instruments it calls into being.
3. Immense responsibility rests today upon the British Commonwealth and the United States of America, which they can only discharge by acting together as the leaders of those who agree with them.
4. The Church of Christ has a distinct task of its own to fulfill.

The author begins with a discussion of "Why Peace Aims" and concludes that, despite political difficulties and the impossibility of giving anything like a blue print of a new world, before we know something of the conditions with which we have to deal, nevertheless some statement of principles of the kind of order we would like is necessary both for its effect upon others (foes and friends) and because of its value for us, and particularly to disabuse Americans of fears many still hold about "British Imperialism." While not ignoring secular plans and efforts, our chief concern as Christians is the specific contribution the Church should make.

There follows a chapter on "The Chaos behind the War," treated under the heads Political, Social, Economic and Moral—a huge subject for twenty pages, but it affords a useful summary leading up to the main thesis in chapter III which deals with "Guiding Principles."

Here the author finds a "considerable measure of agreement among Christian people." "In a sense there is only one ultimate choice to be made in the realm of principle. That choice is between the belief that all human beings are judged by God . . . and the belief that there is no such transcendent standard." This chapter contains lengthy and valuable quotations, such as the letter signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Hinsley, the Moderator of the Free Church Union, and the Archbishop of York. Of this document he says: "It is doubtful whether any such common action has been taken since the Reformation." Another valuable document is that of a meeting at Geneva under the World Council of Churches. Such agreements are both remarkable

and hopeful. Then follows a helpful discussion of "the central issue of responsibility and power, which lies at the heart of the question" of the ethical relation of states.

"The Ideal and the Next Steps" is a practical and helpful chapter, but chapter V on "Britain, America and the Future" is the most constructive and (for some) provocative chapter of the book.

"I believe that in the practical realm there is one answer and only one. . . . It is that there should be such an identity of purpose and policy between the British Commonwealth and the United States of America that under the aegis of the power which jointly they can exercise the constructive labors which are needed so sorely by the world could be undertaken."

His reason for this is not the "blood is thicker than water" notion or any fondness for Anglo-Saxon supremacy, but the fact that "there are in the modern world only two powers which unite the command of great resources, both in armed force and in economic power, with a belief in what may for brevity be called 'liberal' ideas. These are the British Commonwealth and the United States of America. Today there are no others, and the fact is crucial for an understanding of the practical possibilities open to us."

In these two countries the "rights of the state are limited by law, in relation both to its own citizens and to the wider world." This is the essential point of the argument, not that the democracies are more virtuous than the others but that in them power is held in check, that Britain and America "combine the fact of power with an ingrained distaste for the absolute state." But one must read this argument to appreciate it, and it is worth reading and pondering.

The last three chapters are devoted to the Church's part—and by the Church

is meant the Ecumenical Church, the whole body of Christians viewed as the Body of Christ—"His body, expression, vehicle, instrument, the earnest of the Kingdom."

After statesmen have done their utmost there remains the fact that western society today has "no soul, no common ethos, no binding principle commonly acknowledged." This the Christian Church ought to be able to supply. Can it do so? Not as a human society but only by the grace of God. Will the miracle happen? Can this conventional, lukewarm, selfish and sadly divided body be quickened and aroused? And can this be done in time? Everything depends on the answer, and we trust and pray that the author's hope may be justified. Well does he point out the Church's need of penitence and forgiveness as the way to power; and he lays, as well he may, much stress on the present Ecumenical Movement. The Church is faced today with a golden opportunity and a tremendous responsibility. It has the medicine to heal the world's sickness. God grant it may be able to rise above its own petty and parochial interests and see and seize this opportunity to save a dying world.

A slight weakness of this book, inevitable because of its date, is the fact that it was written before America entered the war. This, however, affects only some minor references regarding America's possible attitude and in no way touches the main argument except to strengthen it. As a whole the book is sane, scholarly, realistic, balanced in treatment, and a veritable *multum in parvo* on the subject. It should certainly be read by Christians and all others interested in the part religion can and must play if this awful war is to be followed by anything like a decent peace.

G. ASHTON OLDHAM.

Episcopal Bishop of Albany, N. Y.

Documents of the Primitive Church.

By CHARLES CUTLER TORREY.
New York: Harper and Brothers,
1941. pp. xviii-309. \$3.50.

This notable book continues, with further details and developments, the argument of Professor Torrey's *The Four Gospels and Our Translated Gospels*. It first discusses the date of Mark, arguing that the traditional link with Peter and Rome is a later hypothesis, interpolated into I Peter, and that chapter 13 is a unity, dating the whole in 40 A. D. The prophecy of Daniel was seemingly about to be fulfilled in Caligula's threat: I Thessalonians 4:13-17 and II Thessalonians 2:1-12 draw directly on Mark 13. The second chapter, on the Biblical quotations in Matthew, argues that the Septuagint has had but the slightest influence on their present form and infers that direct quotations from the Old Testament were uniformly given in Hebrew. The third chapter discusses a text which seems to indicate that, before 80, Jews in good standing might regard certain books called *Gilyonim*, i.e. *euangelia* as canonical scripture and had to be cautioned against this view. The fourth chapter advances the hypothesis that the "Western Text" is a retranslation into Greek of an Aramaic version of the Gospel and Acts made early in the second century. In the fifth chapter we come to the Apocalypse: Torrey argues for its being a unity, written in Aramaic in 68, and affording proof of the existence of Matthew at that time. The sixth and seventh chapters, both important for the history of the Church as well as of the New Testament, are devoted to the old Syriac Gospels, arguing that the Sinai text is due to natives of Palestine resident in the region of Antioch and that the Syrian church of the fourth century used the separate Gospels as well as Tatian's harmony of them.

Torrey's theories have been discussed by many scholars and an adequate review of his new volume would require the dimensions of a book and the collaboration of an expert Semitist. Here I can only indicate certain general considerations; and let me say first that, even if no major contention of this work should win general acceptance, *Documents* would nevertheless remain very valuable. Critical orthodoxy today can be as dogmatic and intolerant as the theological orthodoxy of any time, and Torrey's wealth of observations must be sifted but cannot be ignored.

To me as a Hellenist, the hypothesis of an Aramaic original of Revelation, written in the succession of the Old Testament prophets and translated literally because it was thought inspired, is very attractive (just as any similar supposition for the Fourth Gospel is not, though it could be held for some of its materials.) We need not commit ourselves to the further hypothesis of the strict unity of the book as it now stands and may retain belief in some later overworking. Again, the argument, here developed with new energy and thoroughness for the use of the Hebrew Bible in Matthew's quotations is powerful and its importance will not be removed if some individual contentions fail to stand examination. Certainly Torrey's point (p. 89), that there is no use of the Septuagint form of Ps. 22:17 "they pierced my hands and feet" is very powerful. (It is interesting that this form of the text is not used even in Irenaeus, *Demonstration of the Apostolic Preaching*, 80). Further, this book confirms the conclusion of much modern study, that a great part of the Synoptic tradition is intelligible only in the light of Aramaic formulation. Aramaic-speaking Christians of Palestine were perhaps closer at times to contemporary Pharisees than to their brethren in Rome

and Ephesus; and the secondary Semitisms of the Septuagint and the Hellenistic synagogue were dominant in the religious language even of those brethren.

This is much, however unwilling we may be to go further with Torrey. My own unwillingness arises mainly from three considerations. First although in his *Four Gospels* he recognizes the existence of earlier texts and oral tradition, he gives the impression of treating the Gospels as having sprung, like Athena, full-armed from their authors' heads. Secondly, he insists that the Gospels were regarded as being, like the Old Testament, inspired Scripture. Thirdly, to postulate the existence of all four Gospels before 60 raises grave difficulties.

As for the first point, Mark and Matthew seem to me to represent the result of a considerable process of development.¹ "Dual attestations" indicate that; even Mark 13 looks like the reworking of what may have started as a text written under Caligula and in some way known to Paul. The Old Testament quotations in Matthew, which may well draw upon the Hebrew Bible, fall into two groups, Sayings of Jesus, and Fulfillments of Prophecy. Both groups belong to the stock of teaching current in the original community; both necessarily took shape in Aramaic and with reference to the Hebrew Bible, not in Greek and with reference to the Septuagint.² Does not Torrey's work lead us in the main to an original Jesus, or at least to original Aramaic sections and an Ur-Markus and Q, Q, etc., and perhaps to a very early collection of

Old Testament Testimonia with comments, rather than to an original Mark and Matthew? Writing may have been used for such formulations at a quite early date; any assumption that belief in the imminence of a drastic divine intervention was not compatible with Christian literary activity in the 40's is contradicted by the existence of Daniel and of Revelation.

As for the second point, if G. F. Moore's view, developed by Torrey, can be accepted, we have a Rabbinic statement earlier than 80 that the Gospels and the Writings of the Minim (heretics) are not Scripture, which suggests that other people thought they were. If it is so, their view of whatever gospels they had is something exceptional in the early development of Christianity. Until late in the second century, the Sayings of Jesus, and not their vehicles, constitute an authority: the writers of the Gospels had the spirit, yes, but just as did anyone who could say "Jesus is Lord" (I Corinthians 12:3); the authority was, as Hegesippus says, "The Law and the Prophets and the Lord."

Thirdly, the dating of the Gospels raises one direct question. If all four Gospels (or if you will the other three and the pieces of Luke) were in existence in Aramaic before 60, why was the recognition of them as a four so long delayed? Why was the origin of the Fourth Gospel enshrouded in so much doubt as to make the polemic of the Alogoi against it possible? Further, though it is dangerous to press such a question, can any adequate reason be assigned for the genesis of four such works in a limited time and area? A diversity of traditions, oral and written, in Palestine is comprehensible: but this literary elaboration is much more in-

¹ Cf. L. Finkelstein's observations on the transmission of early Rabbinic tradition (*Hebrew Union College Annual*, XVI, 1941).

² May not the supposed quotations from Matthew in Revelation come from an oral or written tradition of Sayings? [Of course in translation they might have been assimilated to the Greek of Matthew]. On the use of Aramaic for literary purposes, cf. now A. T. Olmstead *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, I (1942) p. 41 ff.

³ The quotation in the Epistle of Barnabas of a phrase in Matthew as "it is written" is an exceptionally early instance.

telligible if it is thought to have arisen from the needs of separated communities. Again, why did no trace of a memory of these originals survive for Hegesippus to use? He did indeed quote certain things "from the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac (Gospel)," but is never quoted as attesting our four Gospels, although evidence from him which could bring them near to the time of Jesus would surely have been most welcome.

We know so little about early Christian development that any pure argument from silence would be useless; but here there is strong reason why the authorities should have spoken. On the other hand, the general critical view of the Gospel, and even the main notions of *Formgeschichte* are in a measure substantiated by the record, which postulates diverse origins for the Gospels, indicates the activity of teachers and prophets, and shows the homiletical use of episodes in the life of Jesus.

These reflections, and many others that the book suggests, do not detract from our great obligation to its writer. It is heartening to read (p. xviii) "Some new ground is broken, but both the need and the opportunity of wider investigation are very great." Professor Torrey has fought and is fighting the good fight.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK.

Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Personalities Behind the Psalms.

By Robert B. Whyte. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50—and their literary and spiritual significance.

This Christian Cause. By Karl Barth. Macmillan. 75c. An American edition of three letters written to the French Protestants (Dec. 1939, Oct. 1940) and to the RAF (Apr. 1941).

Christian Doctrine. By J. S. WHALE.

New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. pp. 197. \$2.00.

This volume claims a double interest. First because of its author, and second because of the audience and purpose to which it is directed.

Doctor Whale is President of Cheshunt College, the theological training school of the Congregational Church at Cambridge, England. Like Principal Nathaniel Micklem of Mansfield College, Oxford, he belongs to that widening circle of British thinkers in mid-life who have been profoundly influenced by the trend in theology sometimes dubbed "Neo-Orthodoxy," and has felt compelled to reorient his thought, if not in full agreement with its tenets, at least with reference to them. He is a son, if foster-son, of the Calvinist tradition in Independency. With others of like mind, he signalizes a revival of theological vigor within Congregationalism of great interest to brethren of similar denominational affinities in America. Doctor Whale's distinction has recently been signalized by election to the Presidency of the English Free Church Council in this year of exceptional gravity for Britain's destiny. In that capacity, he will shortly visit the United States. As these pages appear, he will be turning his face westward for a summer of important lectures and preaching appointments in North America.

Interest attaches to his book no less because of its occasion and objective. It consists of lectures in theology delivered to the undergraduates of all faculties at Cambridge University. As such, it is a striking illustration of the hankering after solid dogma which is such a noteworthy feature of wartime in the British universities.

For the title of the work clearly and frankly proclaims its character. It is

an exposition of *doctrine*. The approach is in radical contrast to that which we have come to associate with Christian apologetic to students. Indeed, these lectures are not, strictly speaking, apologetic. If directed to candidates for the ministry as they might well have been, they would fall under the caption not of philosophy of religion but of systematic theology. "Man and his Sin," "the Christian Doctrine of the Fall," "Atonement," "the Trinity and the Incarnation," "the Word and the Sacraments," "the Last Things"—these are among the themes proposed for undergraduate consideration. There is no concession to what are usually regarded as the critical and skeptical sensibilities of young minds deeply schooled in scientific presuppositions.

This is no less true of matter than of manner. Here is theological meat of the solidest texture. We are not offered fragments of Christian truth made understandable and acceptable to the "modern mind." Rather, the massive structure of traditional Christian Faith in its organic wholeness and certitude. Appeal is mainly, not to popular idols of current literary fashion, but to Augustine and Aquinas, Luther and Calvin, and in our own day Karl Barth and Reinhold Niebuhr.

One may differ with Doctor Whale in his theological allegiances at certain points. That is a matter of divergence within the schools. To stress such differences would be to evade the main challenge of his work and to neglect its principal significance. It is almost inconceivable that a course of lectures in such vein and of such substance should have been delivered for undergraduate consumption at Harvard or Yale or Chicago or Stanford. Even more, that they should have been attended by some six hundred students throughout, amidst the distractions and preoccupations of Brit-

ain's peril in the autumn of 1940! Is that a measure of the gulf between the young minds of the two nations? Or, perhaps, the measure of our misreading of what American youth really desire and are prepared to consider? Whether Doctor Whale has elaborated a theology for laymen which could win wide attention from our younger intellectuals is a matter which only trial could test. In any event, he has written a book of immense stimulus and challenge to clergy. After they have taken the full weight of its bare-fisted impact, they might well hazard the experiment of testing its persuasion with the man in the pew, and the lad in the classroom.

HENRY P. VAN DUSEN.

Union Theological Seminary,
New York, New York.

Economic Basis for World Peace.

By JOHN TORPATS. New York:
John Felsberg, Inc. 1941. pp.
222. \$3.00.

John Torpats is a man with two ideas. One of them is that the world can never get rid of war until it has achieved a genuine economic internationalism. The other is that the present administration is unfit to hold office. The blending of these two ideas produces a stimulating, at times constructive, at times maddening, pre-Pearl Harbor book.

Its pre-Pearl Harbor flavor becomes evident only at the end, when the author's criticism of the administration's economic policies turns into an ardent defense of non-intervention. It is unfortunate that the book is thus "dated," for its fundamental thesis is still sound, and it doesn't deserve to be consigned to that limbo reserved for books whose authors plugged for non-intervention. Its closing references are particularly unfortunate because the author is at farthest removed from the "isolationist"—indeed

his criticism of the administration is based on its persistent refusal (as at the London Economic Conference) to work out with other nations constructive solutions to pressing world economic problems, and its equally persistent pursuit of a policy of economic nationalism.

Mr. Torpats proposes four pillars for world peace—an international investment union, “to maintain free access to capital and to insure safety and soundness of international capital placements”; an international monetary union, “to guarantee a sound and stable unit of value in international trade and investments”; an international tariff union, “to bring about a system of free economic communication between nations,” and an international banking union, “to guarantee efficient utilization of mental, manual and natural energies in the production and distribution of goods and services nationally and internationally.”

That these ideas (and in fact most ideas for a just and durable peace) seem to many unrealistic in the face of a global war, should not blind us to the fact that nothing is more powerful than “an idea whose time has come.” The time for reconstruction of our hopelessly archaic and stupid international economic structure will one day come. If Mr. Torpats’ “four pillars” have not been completely buried by the dust and debris of war, they might well serve to support the new structure, provided (as the author would want to insist) the present occupant is not still in the White House.

BRADFORD S. ABERNETHY.

The Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America,
New York, New York.

New Horizons. By Frederic C. Gill. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.00. The only true substance of optimism being faith in God.

When Egypt Ruled the East. By GEORGE STEINDORFF and KEITH C. STEELE. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942. pp. xxi-284. \$4.00.

A third of a century has passed since the publication of the monumental *History of Egypt* by the late James Henry Breasted. Since that event, especially in the twenty-year interim between the first and second stages of the great World War, archaeologists have made many significant discoveries in the Valley of the Nile. Consequently, as Steindorff and Steele state in the preface to the present volume, “Egyptologists have long recognized the need for a new discussion of ancient Egypt in which consideration would be given to the enormous body of new material which has come to light in the last thirty-five years.” They have sought in their joint work in part to supply this need.

They have not sought, however, to replace the classic work of Breasted as the standard history of ancient Egypt, for their discussion is largely concentrated upon the period of the New Kingdom (B. C. 1546-1085). The earlier periods of the Old and Middle Kingdoms, and the later period of Decline, are only briefly treated. But for the period “when Egypt ruled the East” they have given us a work which will be welcomed by the specialist and perused with profit by the general reader. The value of the work is greatly enhanced for all readers by the many superb illustrations of Egyptian art and architecture which are included.

Perhaps the outstanding excellence of the volume lies in the fact that it is much more than a history of the conquests of ancient pharaohs and their proud attempts to secure undying fame by the erection of imposing monuments. We are given a valuable history of the cul-

tural achievements of the ancient Egyptians. This includes a lucid account of the development of the Egyptian hieroglyphic system of writing, and of the extensive literature of Egypt. "Nearly every type of literature is represented—only the drama and the epic are completely lacking." Religious texts, secular songs, aphoristic sayings (often suggestive of the Biblical proverbs), even astronomical and medical treatises are represented. Next a valuable discussion of Egyptian religion is presented. The reader feels it strange that so gifted a people as the ancient Egyptians accomplished so little toward the unification of their religious ideas, that "it certainly should not have been too much for a clever brain to have constituted some sort of order out of this mixture of diverse mythological ideas." Yet, except for the notable but short-lived solar monotheism of Akhnaton, little order was achieved. Exceptionally interesting is the discussion of Egyptian art, including the fine arts of architecture, sculpture, and painting, and also the more significant branches of the applied arts.

This work may be heartily recommended to all persons who desire a vivid portrayal of the unique civilization of the ancient Egyptians before the time of Moses and the emergence of Israel as a distinct people.

GEORGE S. TARRY.

Randolph-Macon College,
Ashland, Virginia.

Look at the Stars. By G. Ray Gordan. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50. Above the chaos of a world gone mad—God still liveth and reigneth.

There Are Sermons in Stories. By William L. Stidger. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$2.00. Illustrative material for preachers, teachers and speakers.

The Literary Lineage of the King James Bible. By CHARLES C. BUTTERWORTH. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. pp. vii-894. \$3.50.

This monograph is a fresh and welcome proof of the widespread interest in the formation of the so-called Authorized Version, which recently has produced more than one real contribution to the knowledge of its literary genesis. Doctor Butterworth starts from the Wycliffite versions in the fourteenth century; but he has unearthed some new or little-known materials, as, for example, a version of Proverbs and Ecclesiastes published by the London printer Godfray. This, he thinks, was actually composed by George Joye, the sixteenth-century translator. After a scholarly survey of the versions, in whole or part, which anticipated the 1611 translation, Doctor Butterworth proceeds to analyze ten selected passages in order to throw light upon the final result. He draws evidence from fifty-eight sources, in order to let the reader "see the familiar features of the Authorized Version gradually taking shape, like the countenance of a friend under the skillful fingers of a portrait painter. It will be found that most of the alteration takes place in the features rather than in the ideas themselves; for, generally speaking, while the forms are changing in the different versions, the substance endures through them all."

The work shows immense research and accurate scholarship. But even the unlearned reader will be fascinated by the data so clearly arranged, for example, on the process by which the twenty-third psalm reached its final English form. It does not follow, of course, that all the items assembled here were before the 1611 translators. Sometimes, too, it must be allowed, they are more

curious than significant. Yet Doctor Butterworth has broken new ground for experts in this book, and introduced his readers to more than one not unimportant predecessor of the English classic.

Luckily it is not quite accurate to say that the preface of the 1611 translators "to the reader" is "no longer printed." It will be found in some cheap, finely printed editions of the Authorized Version produced by the Cambridge University Press. And recently Professor Goodspeed has issued a charming reprint at the University of Chicago Press.

JAMES MOFFATT.

Union Theological Seminary,
New York, New York.

Principles of Christian Living. By
GERALD BIRNEY SMITH. Revised
by Leland Foster Wood. Chicago:
The University of Chicago Press.
pp. vii-280. \$2.00.

"He knows his subject so well," said the layman about a preacher, "that he uses short strong words to tell his meaning and not long ones to conceal it." In words that are short, direct and clear this book tells how Christian ideas are to become actions.

It is refreshing to read a book on ethics which avoids purple literary fire for the helpful glow of sustained interpretation of Christian principles. Eighteen factual chapters deal with motives and actions in historical, private, ecclesiastical, devotional, political, cultural and industrial areas, with the purpose of finding Christian patterns of response.

There are many things to commend: the appreciation for twilight zones of morality where black night and bright day both are excluded; the brief but suggestive treatments of Catholicism, Lutheranism, Calvinism and Anglicanism in relation to perennial perplexities; the splendid outline of moral freedom;

the discussion of sin from two angles: the historic and the contemporary; the questions listed for discussion and the large bibliographies at the end of each chapter.

The paragraph headings in capitals chart the reader's return for helpful review; the flashes of wit, as for example in the suggestion that "trial marriage" be used in reverse by having the lovers try the experiment of getting along without each other, brighten the matrimonial gloom which so often accompanies treatments of modern marriage; the realistic approach to the problems of management and labor and the quotation of five standards by which economic situations and proposals can be tested are unusually relevant.

It is not to be forgotten that "Principles of Christian Living" has already proved its merit for it was originally published during the First World War and has now been revised by Doctor Wood who was a student in Gerald Birney Smith's classes when the book was being written.

Here then is an enduring volume for private study, a splendidly prepared text for the classroom, a book to sensitize the conscience, a treatment not always to produce agreement but one which never fails to increase more down to the earth thinking and inspire more up to the heavens living.

RAYMOND I. LINDQUIST.

The First Presbyterian Church,
Orange, New Jersey.

The Student's Handbook. The
Methodist Publishing House. \$1.50.
An invaluable aid to every novice in
the ministry.

The Way of the Transgressor. By
Costen J. Harrell. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50. A series of realistic sermons on sin, its consequences, and the holiness and compassion of God.

The Philosophy of Alfred North Whitehead. (The Library of Living Philosophers, Vol. III.) Edited by PAUL ARTHUR SCHILPP. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1942. pp. xx-745. \$4.00.

Probably most people would feel the subject of this third volume of Professor Schilpp's unique series to be more "religious" than the subjects of the preceding volumes (Dewey—who has an interesting essay in this volume—and Santayana). And three of the twenty-one essays are devoted to religious topics: "Immortality" (Whitehead, the Ingersoll Lecture, one of three essays contributed by the philosopher himself); "Whitehead's Philosophy of Religion" (a readable, clear presentation by J. S. Bixler); and "Whitehead's Idea of God" (by Charles Hartshorne). Some of the other essays deal in part with religion, perhaps most interestingly Dean Holmes's discussion of "Whitehead's Views on Education" and A. D. Ritchie's "Whitehead's Defense of Speculative Reason."

The "Immortality" is a brief outline of the philosopher's conception of religion. The immortality defended is *neither* the popular notion of the individual's passing on to new adventures after death, nor is it an impersonal survival of abstract values, or a mere absorption into the absolute. It is rather the immortalizing of each life, just as lived on earth, and with all its personal flavor, in the everlasting being of God, his unimaginably perfect, all-sympathetic memory (though this latter word is not used). The essay is too condensed to make its point clear unless interpreted against the background of other writings, particularly the great last chapter of *Process and Reality*, and the chapter on "Peace" in *Adventures of Ideas*. (The topic is also discussed in my own

essay, mentioned above.) The lecture has some interesting remarks about the nature of God, for instance that "the ascription of mere happiness, and of arbitrary power to the nature of God is a profanation." Rather God is to be conceived in terms of "Tragedy, Sympathy, and the Happiness evoked by actualized heroism. . . . These are the human terms in which we can glimpse . . . the immortality of the World of Action . . . in God's nature." Here, then, is a philosopher who, unlike many famous "Christian" theologians (*as men* they may have been Christian), really believes that vicarious suffering, love which shares the sorrows of others, is of the essence of God. Thus the horrible idea that, though God "loves" us, our tragedies never introduce the least unhappiness, nor our achievements the least additional happiness, into his ocean of pure "bliss" or "felicity" is rejected—for the first time in a major philosophy, unless we except a few doctrines, like that of William James, which go to the opposite extreme of a God so vaguely "finite" or "imperfect" that his religious value becomes doubtful for a contrary reason. Whitehead's God is not "imperfect" in knowledge or love, but only in enjoyment, and this for the reason that perfect enjoyment is shown to be meaningless in Whitehead's philosophy. By the very nature of all values there is always the possibility of a richer happiness, even for God, and it is thus that human life can contribute to the Everlasting, by adding itself as a new melody to the never-ending divine symphony.

Some of the essays in this volume are excellent but highly technical, for instance Victor Lowe's brilliant study of "The Development of Whitehead's Philosophy." Some are more or less in opposition to Whitehead (Dewey's is moderately or partly so) but nearly all

admit his pre-eminent greatness. It is to be hoped that the book will aid in understanding the greatest philosophical theist of our time.

CHARLES HARTSHORNE.

The University of Chicago,
Chicago, Illinois.

What We Can Believe. By
RANDOLPH C. MILLER. New
York: Charles Scribner's Sons,
1942. pp. xiv-240. \$2.00.

Doctor Randolph C. Miller, teacher in the Church Divinity School of the Pacific and Episcopal Chaplain at the University of California, states what he considers the essential beliefs of Christianity concerning God, the Bible, Jesus Christ, the Church, Prayer and the Kingdom of God.

A more-fitting title would be, "Can We Believe Anything?" The author accepts *uncritically* the most radical conclusions of destructive Biblical criticism and proceeds to draw still more radical conclusions of his own. "There is no revelation once for all in the Bible or anywhere else." As to the Old Testament, the interpretation of God is to him of course "primitive and anthropomorphic"; but he is equally radical concerning the New Testament. He does not hesitate to speak of "the myths, legends, and other forms of interpretation which are present throughout the whole New Testament." The first three Gospels do not agree with the Fourth Gospel. "John" is valuable primarily as devotional reading based upon the insights of an unknown "elder" of Ephesus. The Fourth Gospel "distorts the meaning of the incarnation as given by Paul." The Christmas stories are legends. "Their importance as religious myths cannot be overestimated, and they have a permanent place in Christian literature, but they are not history and do not affect the doctrine of the incarna-

tion." He grudgingly admits "there is certainly an historical kernel in the drama of Holy Week."

Jesus fares no better at the author's hands. "Throughout the Gospels, it is assumed that Joseph was the father of the Nazarene." "It is probable that Jesus' ministry was inspired by the teachings and fate of John the Baptist." He even arranges the dates so as to limit the public ministry of Jesus to one year or less. "We may estimate that Jesus began his ministry in 28 A. D. and was crucified in the spring of 29." Jesus did not anticipate his crucifixion "at least until the very last moment." He expected the coming of the Kingdom to be consummated at that very Pass-over. "It is doubtful if he claimed to be the Messiah, much less to be God."

Later chapters on Prayer and The Kingdom of God have some real value. The author seems to forget some of the things that he does not believe and proceeds to discuss God and Repentance and Faith as if they were true. Especially helpful is the exposition of the Model Prayer. With his scant respect for the Gospel records, one wonders where the author found a dependable text of the Model Prayer.

In speaking of Conversion he forgets himself into genuine enthusiasm, "Nicodemus simply did not understand, but only men who are blind can fail to see the work of God in the conversion of Paul, in the change that came over Augustine, in the work of Francis of Assisi in giving up a life of gaiety and wealth to go out as an itinerant missionary."

WALTER P. BINNS.

First Baptist Church,
Roanoke, Virginia.

. **Invitation to Worship.** By A. C. Reid. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50. Fifty addresses in miniature—concise, compact, compelling.

Experience and the Christian Faith.

By HOWARD B. JEFFERSON. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942. pp. 230. \$2.00.

This is a most charming book. There is an easy grace about the style and a justness of perspective and proportion in the treatment, and a keenness of insight which make the reading a delight. The work is manifestly the utterance of a mind in firm possession of great essentials and calm enough to look at opposing views without distraction.

So much for the book as a whole. The parts which the present reader enjoyed most were those dealing with humanism and with the problem of evil. It is hard to see why so many religious leaders today feel called upon to shrink from humanism. Many take the statement which Professor Jefferson quotes from Bertrand Russell about the free man's worship as the logical despair in which all humanism is supposed to issue. They seem to think that a mind as able as Russell's and a style so fascinating as his must somehow be in possession of final truth. If I remember aright Russell has something to say in the essay from which Doctor Jefferson quotes about building on the firm basis of unyielding despair. I never have been able to see just how seriously Russell takes his own statements about despair. It is interesting to note that a philosopher as logical as Russell finally puts an emotion at the basis of his belief, for despair is an emotion. One cannot help wondering too how out of such despair such fine devotion to lofty social ideals as Russell's can come from an apostle of despair. It is refreshing to notice the sureness with which Doctor Jefferson deals with Russell and the soundness of his insight into his limitations. He is not dazzled by the brilliancy of a style which is perhaps without a parallel in

modern English, nor does he lose his way because of the force of the Russell logic, which he perceives to fall short of completeness and adequacy. Christian humanism will claim more and more attention as the years go by.

As to the problem of evil, it is gratifying to find an author willing to face it as frankly as this book does. Because there is no complete answer to this question, many thinkers turn away from it altogether, regardless of the fact that more people are disturbed about it than about any other question in the whole range of religious thinking. Any writer on a religious theme ought to show that he has confronted the problem of evil or that he knows it when he sees it. Professor Jefferson has confronted it and has looked all around it, though there is no opportunity here to summarize his positions. He does not attempt any solution of his own but is discerning in his treatment of other's solutions. The value of facing frankly the problem as this book does is that doing so helps to make the problem of evil tolerable, even though it cannot be made solvable.

I wish the younger school of writers would not quote so much. Of course quoting is altogether necessary when one is dealing with views which one is criticizing, but not so necessary for illustration or reinforcement of one's own. I could not help feeling in reading *Experience and the Christian Faith* that the author could better say on his own account what he was quoting than could the quotation itself. If a quotation is not better than anything the writer himself could say, the quotation is a step down, and a jar to the movement of the reader's mind.

FRANCIS J. MCCONNELL.

Bishop, The New York Area,
The Methodist Church,
New York, New York.

Poetry As a Means of Grace. By

C. G. OSGOOD. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1942. pp. 131. \$2.00.

Here is a book that is frankly didactic. The author according to his own words has had long experience in "trying to teach students how to find their way among books." In this volume, the chapters of which were first designed and delivered as lectures, he undertakes to persuade his readers to choose some single poet whose writings shall be matter for lifetime reading and study. After a chapter entitled "Your Poet" he sets about the evidently delightful task of showing in four eminent examples how such a study should be pursued and what its excellent fruit may be. And he must be both a dull and a hard-hearted reader who does not get both pleasure and profit from this wise and genial teaching.

The four poets are Dante, Spenser, Milton and Samuel Johnson. In each instance he is saying to his reader: this is the fine mingling of delight and edification that is sure to be your portion if you take this man for your poet. This is how you are to be rewarded if you spend a good part of your reading time over a period, not of months but of years, in a determined but always willing and happy effort to know this man better—to apprehend his spirit more vividly, to know his meaning, even to its depths, more surely.

If the reader finds, as he well may, particular satisfaction in the presentation of the case for that one of the great four with whom he himself is best acquainted, this is quite as it should be, and altogether to the author's praise. It will justly be argued that if our teacher writes with such warmth and discrimination about this one whom I know, it is more than probable that he speaks with authority in his dealing with these others concerning whose person

and whose work he writes with no less evident affection and understanding. Indeed only a forward and rebellious mind can come to the end of this charming book without resolving so far to yield to its friendly and scholarly persuasion as to set about getting better acquainted with at least one of these other mighty spirits.

So far as ministers of the Gospel are concerned they can be sure of keeping company with a man who is not only writing sound criticism but is at the same time making his ungrudging and cheerful confession of faith in the substance of that majestic Christian tradition which all too many literary persons have either pushed aside or else touch upon shamefacedly and halfheartedly. I salute Professor Osgood and commend his book to lay folk and clergy with equal enthusiasm.

J. V. MOLDENHAWER.

The First Presbyterian Church,
New York, New York.

God's Back Pasture. By ARTHUR WENTWORTH HEWITT. Chicago: Willett, Clark and Company, 1941. pp. 144. \$1.50.

When President Theodore Roosevelt appointed his Country Life Commission to study the physical and spiritual needs of rural America, and the Commission made its report in 1909, there began a new American literature concerning "God's Back Pasture." Arthur Wentworth Hewitt's three books are a part of that literature. His first book, *Steeple Among the Hills*, published in 1926, is a joyous song of a Vermont minister at work. It contains in rapid narrative style the background incident out of which his later books, his wisdom literature, have come. Doctor Hewitt's second book, *Highland Shepherds*, 1939, and his best, speaks wisely to layman and minister concerning the

uniqueness of the rural ministry. It is the best handbook for the rural minister since Warren H. Wilson produced the pioneer books in this field. Now, is added *God's Back Pasture*. This volume concerns the field in which the *Steeple*s and the *Shepherd*s are set. Doctor Hewitt's intent was to make this book more sociological in approach. He does this with a quick survey of the field and a dismal diagnosis. "The picture may be very dark," he concludes. "It is owing to that very fact, that if any pastor whose soul is full of light should stand at its center, he would shine like Jesus at the transfiguration." But it is after Hewitt leaves his first section that he hits "pay dirt" and with keenness, wit, and concrete illustration sets forth the temporal areas into which a trained minister, rurally trained, must go with his Christian program. He offers wisdom which has come not alone from a knowledge of the literature of his field, but from that almost lost art of reading directly from life. His conclusion to the chapter "Bucolic Economics" illustrates this. "In the foregoing pages complete solutions are offered for the financial difficulties of the rural church. They are wholly sufficient. There is no arrogance in saying so, for I did not originate them. Yet as you read you will feel that your problem is not solved. That is because what we are really looking for is some formulae which, laid down without labor, will automatically, willy-nilly, banish our troubles. Such a solution does not exist. We forget that after we have been given the perfect solution, set forth with unmistakable clearness, the labor is only begun. That is why I go back so often to my original postulates. The only solution for any rural problem is the right kind of man, obedient to God, dropped in the middle of the troubles and dealing with the circumstances according to consecrated com-

mon sense." The successes and failures of my companions in the rural church ministry, and the students I teach and supervise in rural church methods, demonstrates the truth of this observation.

In this brief book, though it is quite New England in its origin, is to be found a gratifying amount of reference to the personalities, literature and philosophy in rural life. It is a heartening summation of progress from John Frederic Oberlin to 1942; and it might well serve as an introduction for new leaders to the field of the rural church until the first systematic text is written.

PAUL ROSS LYNN.

Hartford Theological Seminary,
Hartford, Connecticut.

The Evangelical Doctrines of Charles Wesley's Hymns. By J. ERNEST RATTENBURY. London: The Epworth Press. pp. 365. \$2.50 (12/6d net).

Clement of Alexandria says that the members of the early Christian fellowship "sailed the seas and plowed the fields singing praises unto God." The early Christians were a singing people. Jesus himself realized the fortifying power of song, for, while in the upper room just before going out to the ordeal of Gethsemane, he joined with his beloved community in singing a hymn. The hymn has always been a distinguishing mark of a normal healthy Christian society.

Dr. J. Ernest Rattenbury discusses "The Evangelical Doctrines of Charles Wesley's Hymns," in the Fernley-Hartley lectures for 1941. Religion is an art. Charles Wesley was an artist, not a scientist. He voiced his insights and interpretations of life and love in more than 7,000 hymns. He did not write a formal theology, but he did express the convictions of his mind and heart.

Charles Wesley was not a theologian in the sense that Augustine, Calvin or Schleirmacher were scholars in "the queen of sciences." But one may well ask, with Dr. Rattenbury, if painstaking research is the best way of ascertaining the truths of religion? Charles Wesley was a well-trained scholar whose experience of the Christian purpose took the wings of music for utterance.

"His most vital doctrines were intuitions, not ratiocinations. He won his way to truth by moral and spiritual struggle and evangelistic practice rather than by intellectual research. He was a theological artist, not a theological scientist, but when he gave rich, beautiful, and poetic form to truth which convinces, was it less true because it had been reached by the intuitional mode of the poet or the devotional mood of the penitent rather than by the intellectual technique of the philosopher?" (Page 86.)

Charles Wesley did not ignore the historic element in Christianity. He knew that it had a date in time and a place in the story of man. He celebrated the disclosure of God's love in Christ. The highest and deepest expressions of religious truth are fringed with mystery and so command reverence. Worship and adoration are the soul of religion. Charles Wesley expresses this in one of his greatest hymns (the second stanza of which unhappily has been omitted from *The Methodist Hymnal* of 1935):

"'Tis mystery all! the Immortal dies!
Who can explore his strange design?
In vain the firstborn seraph tries
To sound the depths of love divine;
'Tis mercy all! let earth adore:
Let angel minds inquire no more."

The Wesleyan message was the gospel of divine grace. God is love was the note sounded again and again by the

evangelical revival. God's love was not merely for the elect, the chosen; it was for every man. "PURE, UNIVERSAL LOVE THOU ART" was the discovery of "Wrestling Jacob." The early Methodist hymnbooks always capitalized this line to lend emphasis to the central testimony of the Wesleyan movement. The truth is arrived at, not through intellectual inquiry, but through spiritual combat. Calvin could proclaim the care of God toward those whom God had chosen. It was Charles Wesley's message that God had chosen everybody, that Christ was the Saviour of all mankind.

"A world he suffer'd to redeem;
For all he hath the atonement made."

The doctrines of Methodist hymnody are based upon Catholic truths and evangelical insights. Contemporary Methodism has but a slight acquaintance with Charles Wesley's prodigious output of hymns. The American 1935 edition of *The Methodist Hymnal* carries but 54 of his hymns and the British 1933 edition of *The Methodist Hymn Book* 265 of his hymns; most of these hymns are only extracts or abbreviations from the 7,000 or more that he wrote. When the present 1935 American edition of *The Methodist Hymnal* was being edited, at one of the Commission meetings one of the Bishops protested the omission of one of Charles Wesley's hymns by asking, "What are you doing to Charles Wesley?" One of the commissioners replied, "We are saving his standing and reputation in the life of today."

The Charles Wesley hymns used today in our churches are those most valuable for worship and song. But if one desires to know the theological background and the religious emphasis that made the evangelical revival such a potent force in eighteenth-century Eng-

land, one must come to know the hymns of Charles Wesley. They present the truths that were at the heart of the movement. They do not omit or overlook the ugly side of the Calvinist-Wesleyan controversy. The almost savage verses of one hymn are typical of the whole polemic:

"Whoe'er admits; my soul disowns
The image of a torturing God,
Well-pleased with human shrieks and
groans,
A fiend, a Moloch gorged with
blood!

"Good God! that any child of Thine
So horribly should think of Thee!
Lo! all my hopes I here resign,
If all may not find grace with me."
(Page 117.)

Charles Wesley was essentially a Lutheran in his conviction that man's real knowledge of God comes in and through Christ. Man's need was met by God's redeeming power. "The successful appeal of the Wesleys to England was made by men who had a dynamic gospel message to proclaim to the people. What was vital to that message was their belief in the potent love of God manifested in Christ on the Cross for every man." (Page 213.)

Charles Wesley's eucharistic hymns are an important part of his abiding contribution to the Church. The Church's central act of worship is the Holy Communion. Charles Wesley wrote hymns for every part of the Communion office. How ordinary bread and wine could be channels of spiritual insight he did not discuss:

"How He did these creatures raise,
And make this bread and wine
Organs to convey His grace
To this poor soul of mine,

I cannot the way descry,
Need not know the mystery;
Only this I know—that I
Was blind, but now I see."
(Page 218.)

"Perhaps nowhere is it more easy to discern the difference evangelical faith made to inherited belief than in the Communion hymns. Charles Wesley always thought of the Sacrament as the God-ordained channel of pardon and renewal. He has recorded how at times even before his conversion he received blessing there, but how often he left it with a cold heart; he has recorded also how evangelical experience made this devotion a radiant means of grace to his soul. He found in it the very heart of his gospel—the gospel of salvation to every man through the death of Christ. When he and his followers received it they were often intoxicated with joy, and their Eucharistic feasts were not formal duties, but literally love-feasts." (Page 227.)

As the Church is more and more showing an interest in the essential unity of its various parts it is well that Methodism remembers its heritage of universalism and freedom.

OSCAR THOMAS OLSON.

Epworth-Euclid Church,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Religion As Experience and Truth.

By WARREN NELSON NEVIUS.
Philadelphia: The Westminster
Press, 1941. pp. 438. \$3.00.

The author of this volume is head of the department of Religion and Ethics, Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, and author of at least two preceding volumes. One is a study of the Old Testament, its history and religion; the other is a discussion of the meaning of the moral life. These

two books presuppose acquaintance with the literature and life of at least two ancient peoples, the Hebrews and the Greeks, and provide a solid background of information against which the present volume is written.

The volume on *Religion as Experience and Truth* contains three sections. The first purports to be a descriptive study of the nature, origin, development, practices and psychology of religion. The second consists in two chapters on the problem of knowledge in general and the problem of religious knowledge in particular. This rather brief excursus into epistemology eventuates in an idealistic theory of knowledge with comprehensive coherence as the test of truth. (p. 193). The third section of the book consists in an analysis of the major topics relevant to the field of theology: God, evil, human freedom and divine sovereignty, and immortality. The conclusions reached are consistently Theistic, and would be acceptable to many contemporary American thinkers in religio-philosophical fields.

The method selected by the author to validate these conclusions is not too happy. Two examples may serve to illustrate his approach. In the first chapter of the book, "The Nature of Religion," the author presents his definition of religion. This definition emerges from an examination of preceding conceptions. These theories are classified as "friendly" or "unfriendly." After a brief examination of samples from each category, the author proposes his own. It is frankly the result of selective criticism. Elements are selected from some of those surveyed and are synthesized into a new theory.

The process of surveying and criticizing the results of previous investigation is useful and legitimate. It may well be called the clarification of hypotheses. As such, however, it is prelimi-

nary. When it has been completed, one is then ready for methods of procedure and the collection of data. Nevius, however, assumes that when he has clarified his hypothesis he has verified it. This assumption is highly suspect, to say the least.

This method comes to more adequate expression in the third part of the volume, the section which treats of the conception of God. It is here transformed into "the method of residues." The various possible hypotheses are presented for consideration. A principle of elimination is selected, and the false or irrelevant theories are rejected. The validity of this method depends upon two things: (i) the care with which the relevant hypotheses are explored, and (ii) the soundness of the principle of elimination. Professor Nevius has been rather careful in the collection of hypotheses, but his principles of elimination are subject to question. At times he rejects a given hypothesis because it "is inadequate to explain" a given phenomenon (p. 221); at other times he rejects it because it fails to meet the "demands" of the religious experience of a selective group of persons. The first principle of elimination is highly subjective; many persons will fail to understand what Nevius means by "explanation," and what to him is incomprehensible is to them no less comprehensible than many of the things which he accepts. The second principle, that of "religious demands" raises the whole question which must soon be faced, namely, Does man's mind determine what *must be*, or does *what is* determine how man shall think? Until that question has been faced and answered, the reasoning employed in this volume is subject to serious question.

WILLIAM H. BERNHARDT.

The Iliff School of Theology,
Denver, Colorado.

The Lord's Prayer. By ERNEST
FREMONT TITTLE. New York:
Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. pp.
127. \$1.00.

The best buy in books in years! This, despite the fact that the book has not been written yet that covers the Lord's Prayer. There is too much to it. That prayer is like a window opening, letting in the light. But Tittle's treatment will take its place with Rittelmeyer's and Deane's as among the best. And his is by all odds the most contemporary and interesting! This lean book has an empire in its brain! Tittle never lets his reader down. You may differ with him, but he is bound to do you good. He gives you new ideas, new ways of putting things, even new problems. He gives you the best he has—and who just now has better?—in every phrase and chapter. And he always keeps God first.

Tittle discusses the Lord's Prayer rather than prayer itself. Unintentionally, he supplies a curious lack in the current output on prayer. Buttrick, who says so much so often in his great book as at times to suggest surfeits, is least at home here. But Tittle thrills to it. Its pertinence has gripped him. "We pray that the name of God may be hallowed in a world where the true nature of God is still largely unrecognized. We pray that the kingdom of God may come in a world that appears to be ruled by pride, greed, cunning, and military force. We pray that the will of God may be done on earth as it is in heaven; realizing that the present odds against its being done are terrific. We pray for daily bread in a world where millions go hungry, although there is bread enough and to spare." Take the Lord's Prayer seriously, and the whole order of life, economic, political, social, will have to be reversed. "I am bound in

daily life so to speak and act as to convey to others a true and not a false idea of God." Just how to convey a true idea is set forth in great clarity and power. Here the gospel gets its social sense, not out of the finely spun theories of some revolutionist, but right out of the mouth of Jesus. It is Tittle's fidelity to Jesus that gives this book its unusual spiritual power. The hard of heart, who have evaded the pleas of our McConnells and our Wards, will have a time of it to make the hurdle of this book.

It seems to me that a study such as Rittelmeyer's, which makes much, and might well have made most, of "who art in heaven," stresses aspects for which Tittle's study, based primarily on "Our Father," has no room. It also seems to me that *the effect of the experience of Christ on economics*, which is stewardship, could well have put a finishing touch to this book in a chapter on "Amen." But apparently Tittle wanted to keep down the proportions of his book. And the sense of fairness of this eminently fair modern prophet of ours would have been more apparent had he chosen a single example of iniquity from some labor racketeer. Nor need one fear that the validity of Christianizing civilization depends upon the argument (which seems accurate enough) which Tittle hurls at the Barthians. Civilization will feel the effect of Christ once people get economic results out of their religious experience. Then it will follow as the night the day.

But if you feel that in this or that the book fails or could be more strong, you are bound to feel that here is a book that has the edge on modern prophetic utterances, and that you can give to your layman without fear that it is going to be misunderstood. "Forgive us our debts" is so great a chapter that every sentence shines! One wishes our Com-

mission on Evangelism could issue it in pamphlet form. And yet, it is the cumulative effect of the total presentation of this prayer that brings home the mighty message that one cannot be spiritual and "be indifferent to the needs of the body and the conditions of the world." If ever there was a **MUST** book, this is it!

JOHN M. VERSTEEG.

Walnut Hills-Avondale Church,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

Ransoming the Time. By JACQUES MARITAIN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1942. pp. xii-322. \$3.00.

Here is another book by the distinguished neo-Thomist philosopher and theologian, Jacques Maritain, formerly professor of philosophy at the Institut Catholique in Paris and now, since 1940, in residence in New York City.

It is little wonder that Professor Maritain is much in demand as a lecturer at universities and special conferences. His great erudition in classical and medieval scholarship, his wide acquaintance with modern currents of thought, his originality and penetration in philosophic appraisal and analysis, and, best of all, his personal exemplification in life and speech of his belief that "the last word always belongs to friendship and charity" in the devoutly Christian sense, make him a person to be prized by all who value Christian culture.

That Professor Maritain is addressing himself to these times is clear in his choice of the title from St. Paul's letter to the Ephesians: "Ransoming the time, because the days are evil."

The book consists of ten distinct articles, a few of which had been published before in France. Though the topics are diverse, the theme is one: man and his destiny, as viewed by a Christian. Those interested in Bergson will learn

much from the two chapters devoted to the metaphysics and religion of Bergson. Maritain was an enthusiastic, though critical, student of Bergson's in earlier days; and toward the close of Bergson's life came to be in intimate relation with him. An admirer of Bergson not knowing about this friendship and the great esteem in which Maritain held Bergson would find some of the critical passages in these chapters unusually severe. But it would hardly be expected that a convinced Thomist for whom logic and the intellect, substance and revealed religion mean much would accept Bergson's empiricism, nominalism, and substitution of process for substance. Maritain and Bergson come closest no doubt in Bergson's latter-day high estimate of Christian mysticism, although once again one could hardly expect a Christian writer to accept Bergson's identification, hesitant though it is, of the *élan vital* with the God of Christian love. The wonder is not that Maritain and Bergson differed, but that starting from such fundamentally different points of view they came together at all. It is a great tribute to the wide-hearted spirit of both.

But while the philosopher may be most interested in these essays on Bergson, and perhaps in another on the Political Ideas of Pascal, the general religious reader will be much attracted by the fine and inspiring essays on the true bases of human equality and brotherliness in spite of differences of creed, color, and race. Here Maritain is at his best. Special attention is given to the "nightmare" of anti-semitism in which the thesis is convincingly defended that anti-semitism is "covert hatred of Christianity." How deeply the Catholic Church has been interested in modern social progress, particularly as regards fair treatment of labor and better understanding among nations, is amply demonstrated by quotations from recent papal encyclicals.

The last two chapters are not examples of successful communication. The translation was no doubt made with care, but Gallicisms of word and sentence-structure remain nevertheless. For a French writer Maritain's style is often surprisingly complex. But these are minor considerations. It is good to read and have in our midst a writer so catholic in the full sense of the term.

CORNELIUS KRUSE.

Wesleyan University,
Middletown, Connecticut.

Conquest of Death. By F. TOWNLEY LORD. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942. pp. 182. \$1.50.

F. Townley Lord was for many years pastor of the great Bloomsbury Baptist Church, London, England. Recently he became editor of the Baptist *Times*, the British Baptist paper. Doctor Lord is a scholar, a teacher, widely informed, and has a sure grasp of a rational Christian philosophy of life.

The sub-title of this book is "A Christian Interpretation of Immortality." The subject is treated under two major captions: The Problem and The Christian Interpretation. The problem is given in four chapters: Dark Looms the Grave; Man, Know Thyself; Is Proof Possible?; Death of the Hero.

The inquiry as to the problem is limited to (a) Christians who want to know how the traditional view stands in the light of modern thought; (b) those who profess to have no special interest in the Christian view but who are yet "subdued and wistful before an open grave." With the latter group in mind he begins his consideration with non-Christian presuppositions.

After giving the history of the conception of soul and giving reasons for its rejection he affirms the necessity of a real "center" of conscious life. He

shows that the fact of spiritual growth has its bearing on our conception of life after death.

Immortality means more than mere survival after death. It implies a quality of life that is desirable when adjudged by the highest standards we know. After showing that the mechanistic, materialistic, merely behavioristic conceptions of personality will not stand he shows that the supremacy and liberation of mind is the goal towards which nature is working. Biology, physiology, psychology leave the question of immortality an open one. It is necessary to take account of man as a citizen of a moral and spiritual universe.

Because immortality is demanded by man's moral experience there must be implied the reality of man's spiritual nature and the eternal value of spiritual achievement.

This leads into the Christian answer to the great question. Whatever else one makes of the resurrection of Jesus it is an historic fact that it is the foundation of the apostolic faith; it gave the note of joy to the apostolic church; it changed the sacred day from the Sabbath to the first day of the week; it accounts for the existence of the Christian Church.

The quality of the Christian life is to be explained in "the sharing of the divine life." Herein is the meaning of sonship. As to the nature of the resurrection body Doctor Lord writes a reasoned path to the conclusion that "The Christian view does not demand the persistence of the body of this life; it has played its part and personality has appropriated its values; the life after death finds expression in a new medium."

As to the consequence of the sequence of decisions in this life the author concludes that "Behind spatial and material metaphors lie real values of the life to come: the blessedness of living in

the presence of God and the horror of seeing his face turned away from us."

Is there hope for all? Doctor Lord's discussion is most interesting and informing and leads to his conclusion that "probation after death is demanded in the interests of justice."

This book is heartening indeed to the most intelligent Christian and surely leads to conviction which well might enter into preaching and teaching as well as into the poise and composure giving philosophy of life going on after the experience of death. Most heartily do I commend this book as a basis for a series of church meetings, lectures to any group, a basis for funeral messages, and especially as something which will give body and conviction to the timeless Easter message. I thank God for Doctor Lord and this, one of the very best of his dozen or so books.

FREDERICK ERDMANN SMITH.

Austin Baptist Church,
Chicago, Illinois.

Followers of Jesus. By Elizabeth Scott Whitehouse. Westminster. \$1.00. Aids for leaders of Junior Departments in Sunday, Vacation and Daily Bible Schools.

These Prophetic Voices. Edited by T. Otto Nall. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.50. Sermons by Chappell, Crane, Day, Harris, Hawley, Jordan, Quillian, Raines, Rice, Score, Sockman and Tittle. Timely messages for today from twelve Methodist pulpits.

The Bible and Its Books. By Charles S. Sewall. Abingdon-Cokesbury. 60c. Historical and literary back-

ground of the composition of the Old and New Testaments.

Jesus in Action. By Benjamin W. Robinson. Macmillan. \$1.50. A program for a vital Christian faith, built around an intimate picture of Jesus and His teachings.

The Golden Book of Prayer. Edited by Donald B. Aldrich. Dodd Mead. \$3.00. Prayers, poetry and other pertinent helps to directionalize personal devotion.

A Letter to My Son. By a soldier's mother. Dutton. Fifty cents. A letter of comfort, challenge and succor to those who face a world of chaos and maladjustment.

Letters to a Soldier. By George Whiting Seaton. Dutton. \$1.00. Information imparted tactfully, and intended for those whose lives are being disrupted by governmental service away from home.

Big Ben. By Earl Schenck Miers. Westminster. \$2.50. The Negro problem in challenging terms of the life of Paul Robeson who "saw, met, and conquered."

When Lights Burn Low. By Helen L. Toner. Abingdon-Cokesbury. \$1.00. A presentation of the elements of faith to rekindle the lights and life of a civilization at its ebb.

Great Companions. Vol. II. Compiled by Robert French Leavens. Beacon. \$3.00. A veritable golden treasury of great readings, ancient and modern, in quotable length and form.